# MEETING

# STATE OF CALIFORNIA PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM BOARD OF ADMINISTRATION OPEN SESSION

ROBERT F. CARLSON AUDITORIUM

LINCOLN PLAZA NORTH

400 P STREET

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

WEDNESDAY, MAY 17, 2017 9:00 A.M.

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER LICENSE NUMBER 10063

# APPEARANCES

# BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Rob Feckner, President

Mr. Henry Jones, Vice President

Mr. Michael Bilbrey

Mr. John Chiang, represented by Ms. Jeree Glasser-Hedrick and Mr. Eric Lawyer

Mr. Richard Costigan

Mr. Richard Gillihan

Ms. Dana Hollinger

Mr. J.J. Jelincic

Mr. Ron Lind

Ms. Priya Mathur

Mr. Bill Slaton

Ms. Theresa Taylor

Ms. Betty Yee, represented by Ms. Lynn Paquin

### STAFF:

Ms. Marcie Frost, Chief Executive Officer

Ms. Liana Bailey-Crimmins, Chief Health Director

Mr. Ted Eliopoulos, Chief Investment Officer

Mr. Douglas Hoffner, Deputy Executive Officer

Mr. Matthew Jacobs, General Counsel

Ms. Donna Lum, Deputy Executive Officer

### APPEARANCES CONTINUED

### STAFF:

- Mr. Brad Pacheco, Deputy Executive Officer
- Mr. Scott Terando, Chief Actuary
- Ms. Marlene Timberlake D'Adamo, Interim Chief Financial Officer
- Ms. Mary Anne Ashley, Chief, Legislative Affairs Division
- Ms. Kara Buchanan, Board Secretary
- Mr. Christian Farland, Chief, Technology Business Management Division
- Mr. Ron Hurle, Acting Chief Information Officer
- Ms. Andrea Spears, Assistant Division Chief, Technology Business Management Division
- Mr. Anthony Suine, Chief, Benefit Services Division
- $\operatorname{Mr.}$  Timothy Taylor, Chief, Enterprise Solutions Development Division

### ALSO PRESENT:

- Mr. Jim Auck, Corona Police Officers Association
- Mr. Chirag Shah, Shah & Associates (via teleconference)
- Mr. Bryan Snow, Corona Police Officers Association
- Ms. Martha Turner, Fossil Free California

	I N D E X	
		PAGE
1.	Call to Order and Roll Call	1
2.	Pledge of Allegiance	2
3.	Board President's Report	2
4.	Executive Reports a. Chief Executive Officer's Report (Oral) b. Chief Investment Officer's Report (Oral)	6 14
5.	Consent Items Action Consent Items: a. Approval of the April 19, 2017 Board of Administration Meeting Minutes b. Board Travel Approvals	15
6.	Consent Items Information Consent Items: a. Board Agenda Item Calendar 2017 b. Draft Agenda for the June 21, 2017 Board of Administration Meeting c. General Counsel's Report d. Communications and Stakeholder Relations	15
7.	Committee Reports and Actions a. Investment Committee (Oral) b. Pension & Health Benefits Committee (Oral) c. Finance & Administration Committee (Oral) d. Performance, Compensation & Talent     Management Committee (Oral) e. Risk & Audit Committee (Oral) f. Board Governance Committee (Oral)	16 18 21 25 25 25
Action Agenda Items		
8.	Approval of Committee Delegations	25
9.	Proposed Decisions of Administrative Law Judges a. William H. Hampton b. Robert Wolf and Kenneth Hale (Consolidated) c. Teodulo Victorio, Jr. d. Vickie Gould e. Lori K. McCoy f. William F. Roth (dec.) (Marilyn A. Roth, spouse) g. April L. Quinonez	26

# I N D E X C O N T I N U E D PAGE h. Donald Rhoads Rachelle M. Ivy i. j. Norma A. Fernandez Mary Hendrix k. Kay Donnelly Kevin Peterson 1. m. Doris F. Pondexter n. Timothy E. Iverson Petition for Reconsideration 10. 28 a. Bradley D. Heinz b. Harry R. Sagala San Juana N. Navarro C. d. Andre Metzler Information Agenda Items 11. IT Governance Overview 28 12. State and Federal Legislation Update 99 13. Summary of Board Direction 105 14. Public Comment 105 Adjournment 111 Reporter's Certificate 112

# 1 PROCEEDINGS PRESIDENT FECKNER: Good morning. We'd like to 2 call the Board of Administration meeting to order. Thank 3 4 you all for being here. The first order of business will be to call the 5 6 roll please. 7 BOARD SECRETARY BUCHANAN: Good morning. 8 PRESIDENT FECKNER: Morning. 9 BOARD SECRETARY BUCHANAN: Rob Feckner? 10 PRESIDENT FECKNER: Good morning. 11 BOARD SECRETARY BUCHANAN: Henry Jones? VICE PRESIDENT JONES: Here. 12 13 BOARD SECRETARY BUCHANAN: Jeree Glasser-Hedrick 14 for John Chiang? 15 ACTING BOARD MEMBER GLASSER-HEDRICK: Good 16 morning. 17 BOARD SECRETARY BUCHANAN: Richard Costigan? 18 BOARD MEMBER COSTIGAN: Here. 19 BOARD SECRETARY BUCHANAN: Richard Gillihan? 20 BOARD MEMBER GILLIHAN: Here. BOARD SECRETARY BUCHANAN: Dana Hollinger? 21 BOARD MEMBER HOLLINGER: Here. 22

J&K COURT REPORTING, LLC 916.476.3171

BOARD SECRETARY BUCHANAN: Ron Lind?

BOARD MEMBER JELINCIC: Here.

BOARD SECRETARY BUCHANAN: J.J. Jelincic?

23

2.4

25

2

```
BOARD MEMBER LIND: Here.
1
 2
             BOARD SECRETARY BUCHANAN: Priya Mathur?
 3
             BOARD MEMBER MATHUR: Good Morning.
             BOARD SECRETARY BUCHANAN: Good morning.
 4
             Bill Slaton?
 5
 6
             BOARD MEMBER SLATON: Here.
7
             BOARD SECRETARY BUCHANAN:
                                         Theresa Taylor?
8
             BOARD MEMBER TAYLOR: Here.
9
             BOARD SECRETARY BUCHANAN: And Lynn Paquin for
10
   Betty Yee?
11
             ACTING BOARD MEMBER PAQUIN: Here.
12
             PRESIDENT FECKNER:
                                 Thank you.
13
             Next order of business will be the Pledge of
14
    Allegiance. I've asked Board Member Lind to please lead
15
   us in the Pledge.
16
             If you will all please rise.
17
             (Thereupon the Pledge of Allegiance was
18
             Recited in unison.)
             PRESIDENT FECKNER: Well, again good morning,
19
20
   everyone.
21
             And Item 3 is the President's Report.
22
             I'd like to begin by saying that 10 months out of
23
    the year we gather here in Sacramento for three days to
24
    receive reports and take action from the CalPERS team.
25
    During this time we have discussion and debates on
```

decision before our committees and this Board, and we hear from our stakeholders on what's important to them.

You might ask yourself how the members of this Board spend their time between meetings. So I'd like to share a few thoughts as my part of the President's Report.

Like you, each of us carries out our daily lives; and many of us have full-time jobs in addition to our work here at CalPERS. But there is one thing we all have in common: We spend countless hours talking about CalPERS, the work we do, and why we believe all workers deserve financial security in their retirement.

We talk about the challenges we face and what CalPERS is doing to address them, so that we can continue to pay the benefits that our members have been promised. We do this before our valued stakeholders up and down the State to assure that our members and our employers know that this Board is committed to the long-term sustainability of this system.

To give you an idea how we've been engaging our stakeholders, over the past six weeks alone various Board members have attended four CalPERS Benefit and Education events, seven Retiree Council meetings, five Active Member meetings, and four Regional Fire Department meetings.

We also dedicate ourselves to continued learning about the financial markets, risk management, health care

trends, and environmental sustainability so we can continue to make well-informed decisions. Since March 1st, Board members have attended 13 conferences; a total of 18 have been in attendance. 11 of us attended last week's Diversity and Inclusion Conference put on by Calpers and Calstrs. That is all important work. We face headwinds when it comes to the cost of pensions, the investment outlook over the next decade, and drug costs, to name just a few of the challenges. And of course there's no shortage of defined benefit doubters that would like to Calpers fail at the cost of retirement security for public employees.

As President, I think I can speak for everyone on this Board when I say that we take our role and fiduciary responsibility to heart. While our perspective during Board week may be generations out, our focus the other 27 days of the month is on building a strong financial foundation for today.

I want to thank my colleagues on this Board for their dedication. The countless hours they put into their roles as fiduciaries of this system and the work they do on behalf of our 1.8 million members and their families daily.

Now, with that I want to offer that coming in June it's going to be CalPERS night at the River Cats. So

a night so we can get out and enjoy each other's company
outside of the board room. It's going to be Tuesday, June
20th. Gates will be open at 6 p.m. The game starts at 7.
Our own CalPERS Patriot Chorus will be singing the
National Anthem that night. So hope to see many of our

CalPERS team members and our Board members out enjoying a nice event at the ballpark that night.

So with that, I see Mr. Jelincic has a comment.
Mr. Jelincic.

BOARD MEMBER JELINCIC: Yeah, I'd like a point of personal privilege.

PRESIDENT FECKNER: Certainly.

BOARD MEMBER JELINCIC: Joseph McCarthy had Roy Cohn and his secret lists of commies in the State Department.

Bill Slaton has Matt Jacobs and his secret list of charges.

I have my own secret file, and I'm going to share some of it with you today.

When Jon Ortiz left the Sacramento Bee, it was a great loss to the paper. Here I have a reprint of his article from December 28th, 2013, entitled "Securities and Exchange Commission looking into CalPERS stock purchases."

What's really amazing about this story is that Mr. Slaton, Jacobs, and Feckner all believe it was based

on my March 14, 2016, comments during an open Investment Committee.

Who knew Jon was a time traveler. How did these gentlemen figure it out? Why do I believe they think that? I can't tell you. The belief is based on a super secret document. If I told you, I would undoubtedly be sent to yet another training.

On the other hand, Bill Slaton could actually come up with charges. If he did so and would make those charges public, just like he did in his demand for my resignation, I would have the ability to offer a public defense. I think it is called transparency.

Thank you.

PRESIDENT FECKNER: Thank you.

Agenda Item 4 - Chief Executive Officer Report.

Item 4a. Ms. Frost.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Good morning,
Mr. President and members of the Board. This morning I'll
update you on some of our important current priorities,
our ongoing outreach activities, and then take a little
bit of time to do some employee recognition.

And I would like to start off with some good news. And you heard this on Monday in the Investment Committee meeting. The Investment team shared the newest analysis from CEM Benchmarking of our efforts to reduce

costs and add value to the fund.

This measurement is only one indicator of performance that we use and furthers our commitment to transparency of the costs that we pay externally.

The efforts are part of INVO's 20-20 Vision to streamline the portfolio by reducing costs and complexity, cutting manager fees, and increasing the use of our internal team members to further reduce costs.

The survey also showed that our Investment team has been able to reduce their operating budget by \$402 million since the 2010-2011 fiscal year.

While those numbers are impressive, I'm particularly pleased with how well we measure up against our peers who report the same data that we do into CEM. The survey says we are cost advantaged compared to our peers. But I would rather just say that we're striving to be as efficient as possible while also increasing the capabilities and utilizing our own team members.

You can see the results of that effort in CEM's conclusion that the cost to manage the CalPERS fund -- or the portfolio was 32.5 basis points compared to the CEM benchmark costs which would have been 42 basis points.

Again, this is based on the set of activities determined by CEM Benchmarking out of Toronto, Canada.

The benchmark also tells us that we're on the

right track to running our operations efficiently and effectively compared to what it would cost others to achieve the same results.

Now on to our Finance and Administration

Committee, where yesterday you heard from our financial team on the employer partner financial health reports.

And you will be receiving these reports each quarter, and they closely monitor the status of our participating employers.

As you know, the goal is to provide support through education and outreach to help ensure that pension contributions are paid on time; not only the contributions, but also the data.

These quarterly reports will highlight proactive work that the team is doing to make sure that we keep the issue in front of us and, more importantly, we keep the issue in front of our members.

We will be placing an employer contribution report on our website as one additional step around transparency. I know we have a lot of active partners with our stakeholder groups who will now have access -- or not yet, but will have access within the next couple of months where they can go out and proactively look at employer contributions, the timeliness of that reporting.

Turning now to health rates. On yesterday the

Pension and Health Benefits Committee heard a presentation on the 2018 health rates. As you know, these are preliminary rates that are still subject to ongoing negotiation. And we certainly heard your feedback yesterday, and will convey those comments to the health plans as we continue our negotiations.

And overall I do think they reflect a great effort to contain costs and keep and sustain the quality health care that we've been providing to our members and employers. We do still have one more month to continue the negotiations before the 2018 health rates will be brought back to you next month.

While I'm speaking of health I'm pleased to let you know that Liana Bailey-Crimmins has been selected as our new Chief Health Director. She's right behind me, I believe.

Liana has been serving in the interim role since December, and immediately in that capacity I think put her successful style of leadership into play and has led our teams through the health rates process.

As the Chief Information Officer in her former role in our IT Branch, Liana's service over the years has been invaluable in helping us advance our technology goals as well. And I'm confident that her strong administrative background and leadership skills will serve the

organization quite well as we focus on the future cost and quality of health care.

Please join me in congratulating Liana on her new position.

(Applause.)

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: And then on another executive recruitment front, interviews have begun for our Chief Financial Officer; and I will keep you posted as that process continues over the next month.

We have spent some time talking about the diversity forum over the course of the last two days. But last week CalPERS and CalSTRS did jointly host the 2017 Diversity Forum, which brought together members of the investment and business communities from across the country.

And it was great to see many of you in attendance, so thank you for that. The day was filled with thoughtfully arranged panel discussions on a broad range of topics addressing diversity and inclusion in the workplace.

There were also two meaningful keynote speakers who helped us better understand the role diversity plays in the corporate world: Helena Morrissey, whose efforts to increase the number of women in Board rooms have really earned her worldwide acclaim; and then John Thompson, who

is the chair of the Microsoft board. And I think their insights and their observations helped showcase why it's so important that we continue to discuss and support this issue. As you well know, CalPERS has long been an advocate of diversity and inclusion in the businesses that we're involved in; and we believe it does lead to stronger financial performance.

The forum was well attended, and I think it was very well organized, and our teams came back with new information on how to advance our work in this important area on human capital.

And I'd like to thank the Investment Office and our Strategic Events management and Public Affairs teams for all of their hard work in putting the event together.

And many of you may have noticed the Seahawk colors that were in --

(Laughter.)

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Sorry.

(Laughter.)

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: I couldn't resist. It's what I first noticed when I walked in the room.

(Laughter.)

24 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: So on to 25 editorial board visits. As I mentioned last month, we

have begun meeting with the media organizations around the State. And we will continue that effort tomorrow with visits to two more newspaper editorial boards, the San Francisco Chronicle and the East Bay Times.

And I think, you know, it's an opportunity and I'm pleased to be able to meet with these boards because we do have a great story to tell about the importance of defined benefit plans as they relate to financial security and retirement. But it's also this organization's focus on ensuring that this fund is available to generations to come. And there's a great story to tell there.

I also had an opportunity to visit our regional office in San Jose, which was really quite fun. It's really an honor and a pleasure to watch our customer service teams in action. And I know many of the Board members have been out to some of the service locations as well and have seen the things that I've seen.

The ease and skill with which these teams, who directly interact with our customers -- they share a very deep level of knowledge about the system and have become really these trusted advisors to the members and the customers as they're getting ready for their own retirement.

I would say they're highly engaged. And at least the interactions that I've been having with them, they're

very candid about what's working well and opportunities where we could possibly make their jobs a little bit easier.

And finally this morning I'd like to end with a moment of employee recognition. This is the time of year when we announce the recipients of the annual CalPERS APEX awards. And APEX stands for achieving performance excellence.

It is a formal awards that celebrates employees who go above and beyond to embody our core values and display a commitment to the CalPERS overall strategic plan and our success.

One of the special I think aspects of this program is it -- it is a peer-to-peer recognition. So they are nominated by their teammates, their peers, who work with them. And not only have the colleagues taken notice of their outstanding performance; they have divided the time -- devoted the time to prepare what I think is a very extensive nomination packet to be considered -- to be considered. So truly peer driven and the recipients of this year's awards should feel proud of this work.

In a couple of weeks we will honor the 53 APEX recipients at a ceremony here in the Auditorium, which is traditionally well attended by family -- family members and friends of the award recipients.

And so I'd like to take a moment now to celebrate their accomplishments and ask them all to stand and be recognized.

(Applause.)

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: So congratulations again on behalf of all of us here today.

And that does conclude my remarks for this morning, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT FECKNER: Thank you, Ms. Frost.

On behalf of the Board, I want to congratulate all the APEX recipients, and thank you for all the work you did on behalf of our members every day. So congratulations.

Leads us to Agenda Item 4b - Chief Investment Officer's Report.

Mr. Eliopoulos.

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: Good morning, Mr. President, members of the board. I have a brief update on the performance of the Public Employees' Retirement Fund as of March 31, 2017.

The Total Fund performance for the fiscal year to date is 8.0 percent. As we discuss often times, we prefer to examine returns over a much longer period of time, as they -- as we believe they are much more meaningful.

In that regard, the three-year return of the fund

is 5.2 percent. The five-year -- did I say the three -- the three-year return is 5.2 percent.

The five-year return is 8 percent. The 10-year return of the Total Fund is 4.6 percent; and the 20-year return of the Total Fund is 7 percent.

All asset classes are within their ranges. Total Fund assets are valued as of March 31st at \$314.7 billion

Mr. President, that is my update.

PRESIDENT FECKNER: Thank you.

Seeing no requests to speak.

Brings us to Agenda Item 5 - Consent Calendar.

I see we have two action items.

What's the pleasure of the Board?

BOARD MEMBER JELINCIC: So move.

15 PRESIDENT FECKNER: I have Mr. Jelincic moving.

BOARD MEMBER MATHUR: Second.

PRESIDENT FECKNER: Ms. Mathur seconding.

Any discussion on the motion?

Seeing none.

All in favor say aye.

(Ayes.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

2.4

25

PRESIDENT FECKNER: Opposed, no.

Motion carries.

Item 6 is the Consent Information Items.

I have no request to move any of those items.

1 We'll move on to Item 7.

7a is the Investment Committee Report.

For that I call the Chair, Mr. Jones.

VICE PRESIDENT JONES: Thank you, Mr. President.

The Committee met on May the 15th, 2017. The Committee received reports on the following topics:

Proposed changes to the Private Asset Class roles and benchmarks; proxy voting activity during the first quarter of 2017; progress on shareowner campaigns and ongoing corporate engagement work; the Investment Office's cost effective strategic objective; the Investment Office Roadmap and Target Operating Model, TOM.

The Chair directed staff to do the following:

Consider the governance and investment implications of master limited partnerships and provide a summary of the findings at a future meeting;

Provide the Committee with a link to the UN Global Principles and provide the Committee with a link to the full CEM report.

The Committee heard a public comment on private equity fees and expenses, CalPERS leadership in policy voting -- proxy voting and corporate governance, the value of transparency and reporting private equity fees, and the impact of divestment on fund returns.

And by the way, subsequent to the meeting I also

asked staff -- since one of the public speakers indicated that the Chair had requested some information but had not received that information, and subsequently we noted that we had received that information, so I asked staff to also provide that information to the Investment Committee.

At this time I would like to share some highlights of what to expect at the June Investment Committee meeting.

Investment managers engagement program update, CalPERS for California Report 2016, and the adoption of capital markets assumptions.

The next meeting of the Investment Committee is scheduled for June 19, 2017, in Sacramento, California.

And that concludes my report, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT FECKNER: Thank you, Mr. Jones.

Mr. Jelincic.

BOARD MEMBER JELINCIC: Henry, on your staff direction --

VICE PRESIDENT JONES: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER JELINCIC: -- you pointed out that you wanted consideration of governance investment implications of master limited partnership. But I think it was larger. It was all of the securities with non-voting or multi-class votings.

VICE PRESIDENT JONES: Yeah, I will follow up

with staff on that.

BOARD MEMBER JELINCIC: Okay.

PRESIDENT FECKNER: Thank you.

Brings us to Agenda Item 7b, Pension and Health Committee.

For that I call on Chair Ms. Mathur.

BOARD MEMBER MATHUR: Thank you very much,

Mr. President.

The Pension and Health Benefits Committee met yesterday on May 16th, 2017. The Committee received several information reports. The first, Customer Services and Support Performance Update, which presented the state of the customer experience and reported on our successes and several of the initiatives being untaken to enhance customer service.

This update also discussed the exceptions that fell below the strategic measure threshold; for example, survivor benefit payments, the IRC replacement benefit plan and service credit purchasing; and the reasons why these exceptions occurred. Donna Lum, Deputy Executive Officer of Customer Services and Support, attended the CEM annual benchmark conference last week. Calpers has been selected to participate on a new steering committee. And Ms. Lum will be the delegate representing Calpers.

The public comment period for the draft

regulations on pensionable comp ends on June 5th, 2017, with the final regulation package due in August.

Liana Bailey-Crimmins, Chief Health Director, reported out on updates for OptumRx, the Affordable Care Act, and health care beliefs. OptumRx continues to make progress improving the customer -- excuse me -- improving the member experience.

On April 17th of this year, the CalPERS team visited the Costa Mesa Center. And OptumRx has expanded the number of sites that members can visit for pharmacy. They've also put a prior authorization-directed team in place.

The Affordable Health Care Act is now at the Senate level. And regarding the health care beliefs, a visit was made to Butte County, and they are providing feedback, and we are also soliciting feedback from all of our stakeholders, both employers and members.

Within the next 30 days roundtable discussions with stakeholders will be done along with surveys. And this will be presented to the Committee at the July off site with some straw person beliefs to be voted on. A straw poll kind of thing.

We also addressed the preliminary 2018 health rates and contracts. And this information item presented information regarding the preliminary unadjusted and

risk-adjusted health benefit plan rates. As noted by our CEO, we expect that to change by June.

With respect to medical and pharmacy benefit strategies, staff presented -- the team presented information concerning potential medical benefit and pharmacy benefit strategies for the self-funded PPO, including adding 12 procedures to our value-based purchasing design; also adding a site-of-care management program for medical-pharmacy, which should help contain costs while delivering excellent value to our members; and adding an educational program designed to reduce the unnecessary use of emergency rooms, a persistent issue as was noted by a public speaker yesterday. Continuing the Castlight tool and expanding Welvie tool and adding the SilverSneakers program will also continue to add benefits to our members.

The pharmacy benefit strategies for 2019 and 2022, which are already under development, were also discussed yesterday.

The Committee received some public comment, first from Al Darby at RPEA; from Donna Snodgrass at RPEA; from ^^Neal Johnson, SEIU 1000; and from Tim Behrens, CSR, regarding various agenda items.

The Chair directed staff to provide context and assist with decision making with respect to impacted

members on future benefit design agenda items and to provide a little bit of additional information about not just the dollars but also the number of members impacted.

At this time let me share a few highlights from what we'll take up in June. Of course, we will approve hopefully the 2018 health benefit rates. We will also review the medical and pharmacy benefits and the medical coverage areas. We will also review the long-term care contract. And the Committee will hear information on the Transition Care Program pilot, spousal subsidy, and the State annuitant contribution formula.

The next meeting of the PHBC is scheduled for August -- scheduled for June in Sacramento, California.

That concludes my report, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT FECKNER: Thank you.

Brings us to Agenda Item 7c - Finance and Administration. For that, I call on the Chair, Mr. Costigan.

BOARD MEMBER COSTIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Feckner.

The Finance and Administration Committee met on May 16th, 2017.

The Committee recommends, and I move, the Board approve the following: Agenda Item 5a, which is to approve the fiscal year 2017-18 annual budget proposal as a second reading in the amount of \$1,676,403,000 and 2,875

2.2

```
1
   positions and approve the transmittal of this agenda item
    to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee, fiscal
 2
 3
    committees of the legislature in accordance with the
    Budget Act of 2016.
 4
5
             PRESIDENT FECKNER: On motion by Committee.
             Any discussion on the motion?
 6
7
             Seeing none.
             All in favor say aye.
8
9
             (Ayes.)
10
             PRESIDENT FECKNER: Opposed, no.
             Motion carries.
11
             BOARD MEMBER COSTIGAN: Agenda item 6a - approve
12
13
    the proposed amendments to the Treasury Management Policy
14
    as part of the annual review required by the policy.
15
             PRESIDENT FECKNER: On motion by Committee.
16
             Any discussion on the motion?
17
             Seeing none.
18
             All in favor say aye.
19
             (Ayes.)
20
             PRESIDENT FECKNER: Opposed say no.
             Motion carries.
21
22
             BOARD MEMBER COSTIGAN: Agenda item 6b, to
23
    approve the proposed amendments to the Treasury Management
24
   Reserve Policy as part of the annual review required by
25
    the policy.
```

1 PRESIDENT FECKNER: On motion by Committee.

Any discussion on the motion?

Seeing none.

All in favor say aye?

(Ayes.)

2.4

PRESIDENT FECKNER: Opposed, say no?

Motion carries.

BOARD MEMBER COSTIGAN: Let me just state it quickly, I do want to thank the Budget staff. Again, I think, Mr. Feckner, as you've said before, great work.

Once again, fourth year in a row the costs have gone down and we've continued to increase the amount of information that's available.

The Committee received reports on the following topics: Participating public agency employer demographics, general information on funded status as well as information on employers with inactive rate plans, the annual stakeholder perception survey report. And then the Chair directed staff to revise the April 18, 2017, meeting minutes to reflect that Mr. Jelincic receives 100 percent reimbursement because he is a CalPERS employee. And as Mr. Jelincic will say, he would get paid regardless, whether he was on the Board or was an employee.

Refine the funded status breakdown to include increments of 10 percent number of employees as well as

rate plan types. Survey employer and employee stakeholders about their views on when members retirees should be contacted in the collection process. And in June we're going to bring back -- staff is going to bring back options for potential action on management neutrality for employee union organizing activities in contracts.

The Committee heard public comment on the following topics: Reporting on participating employers in contract language on management neutrality for employee union organizing activities.

At this time I would like to share some highlights of what to expect at the June Finance and Administration Committee meeting. Staff will provide the Committee with options to consider in pursuit of contract language on management neutrality for employee union organizing activities.

The next meeting of the Finance and Administration Committee is scheduled for June 20th, 2017, in Sacramento.

Thank you, Mr. Feckner. That's my report.

PRESIDENT FECKNER: Thank you.

Ms. Mathur.

BOARD MEMBER MATHUR: Thank you.

I just wanted to note, yesterday at the Committee the annual stakeholder perception survey was presented,

```
1
    and we didn't get a lot of time to talk about that
    particular item. But I just want to note what remarkable
 2
 3
    scores we have on customer service. And that's the result
 4
    not just of the dedication of our team, which it certainly
5
    is, but also all of the efforts that CalPERS has
6
    undertaken to improve, refine, focus our efforts on
7
    delivering truly excellent best-in-class customer service.
8
    And you can see that we have scores that I think are
9
    really unheard of in the private sector.
10
             So I just wanted to make a special note of that.
11
             Thank you.
12
             PRESIDENT FECKNER:
                                 Thank you.
13
             Mr. Costigan, did you have something else?
14
             BOARD MEMBER COSTIGAN: No, in case she had a
15
    question.
16
             PRESIDENT FECKNER:
                                 Thank you.
17
             All right. Brings us to Item 7D, E, and F.
18
    There were no committees meeting, so no report.
19
             Item 8 - Approval of Committee Delegations.
20
             Mr. Jacobs.
21
             GENERAL COUNSEL JACOBS: Good morning, President
    Feckner and Board members.
22
23
             This item gathers together all of the recommended
```

committees have reviewed and approved - or recommended, I

changes to committee delegations that the various

24

25

2.6

```
1
    should say - to this Board over the last several months
    for Board approval. The substantive changes have been
 2
    laid out in the agenda item. There are some
 3
   non-substantive changes that have been -- that are laid
 4
    out in the red-lined exhibits that are attachments to the
5
6
    agenda item. And this is an action item.
7
             And with that, I would take any questions.
             PRESIDENT FECKNER: What's the pleasure of the
8
9
   Board?
10
             BOARD MEMBER LIND: Move adoption.
             BOARD MEMBER COSTIGAN: Second.
11
12
             PRESIDENT FECKNER: Moved by Lind, seconded by
13
    Costigan.
14
             Any discussion on the motion?
15
             Seeing none.
16
             All in favor say aye.
17
             (Ayes.)
18
             PRESIDENT FECKNER: Opposed say no.
             Motion carries.
19
20
             Item 9 - Proposed Decisions of Administrative Law
21
    Judges.
22
             I will say that Chirag Shah, the Boards
23
    independent counsel for administrative law matters, is on
2.4
    the line.
25
             Good morning, Mr. Shah.
```

27

1 MR. SHAH: Good morning, Mr. President and members of the Board. 2 3 PRESIDENT FECKNER: It's good to have you with 4 us. 5 So if there's any questions, Board members, 6 Mr. Shah is here to help us and lead us through that. 7 Mr. Jones. 8 VICE PRESIDENT JONES: Yeah, thank you, 9 Mr. President. 10 I move to adopt the proposed decisions at agenda items 9a and 9c through 9o, with the minor modifications 11 argued by staff to agenda item 9e and 9i; and remand 12 13 agenda item 9b for the taking of additional evidence 14 regarding, A, whether the members' actual job duties 15 constitute their own group or class of employment or, 16 alternatively, B, whether members' classification should 17 determine whether the pay at issue meets the definition of 18 holiday pay under PERL Regulation 57185.

19 PRESIDENT FECKNER: All right. On the motion, is 20 there a second?

BOARD MEMBER GILLIHAN: Second.

21

22

23

2.4

25

PRESIDENT FECKNER: Moved by Jones, seconded by Gillihan.

Seeing any requests on the motion?
Seeing none.

28

```
1
             All in favor say aye.
             (Ayes.)
 2
 3
             PRESIDENT FECKNER: Opposed, no.
             Motion carries.
 4
             Item 10. Mr. Jones.
 5
             VICE PRESIDENT JONES: Yeah, thank you,
 6
 7
    Mr. President.
 8
             I move to deny the petitions for reconsideration
9
    on agenda items 10a through 10d.
10
             PRESIDENT FECKNER: On motion by Jones.
             Is there a second?
11
             BOARD MEMBER HOLLINGER: Second.
12
13
             PRESIDENT FECKNER: Seconded by Hollinger.
             Any discussion on the motion?
14
15
             Seeing none.
16
             All in favor say aye.
17
             (Ayes.)
18
             PRESIDENT FECKNER: Opposed say no.
             Motion carries.
19
20
             Thank you, Mr. Shah.
                         Thank you, sir. Have a good day.
21
             Mr. SHAH:
             PRESIDENT FECKNER: You too.
22
23
             Brings us to Agenda Item 11, IT Governance
24
    Overview.
25
             Mr. Hoffner, et al.
```

1 (Thereupon an overhead presentation was 2 Presented as follows.)

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER HOFFNER: Thank you, Mr. Feckner - Doug Hoffner, Calpers team member - and Board of Administration. I'm going to let the team introduce themselves and present this presentation on IT Governance Enterprise projects, and look forward to the presentation, along with the program team members.

ACTING CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER HURLE: Good morning, Mr. President, members of the Board. Ron Hurle, Team Calpers. We're here to give you an exciting tour on IT governance and project management. And before we get started I'd like the team to introduce themselves. And we'll start with Andrea.

It's an IT thing.

(Laughter.)

ACTING CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER HURLE: These bells and whistles.

TECHNOLOGY BUSINESS MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT
CHIEF SPEARS: Good morning, President, members of the
Board. My name is Andrea Spears, Calpers team member.
And I am the Assistant Division Chief of Technology
Business Management Division and I oversee project
oversight, governance, and the more senior project
managers who oversee our enterprise level projects.

TECHNOLOGY BUSINESS MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF FARLAND: Good morning, Mr. President, members of the Board. I'm Christian Farland. I'm the Chief of Technology Business Management Division.

BENEFIT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF SUINE: Good morning, Mr. President, members of the Board. I'm Anthony Suine, Calpers team member, co-sponsor of Functional Optimization Project with Tim, and chairman of the my | Calpers Steering Committee.

ENTERPRISE SOLUTIONS DEVELOPMENT DIVISION CHIEF
TAYLOR: Good morning. Timothy Taylor, Chief of
Enterprise Solutions Development Division within IT. And
as Anthony mentioned, I'm the IT counterpart on the
Functional Optimization Project.

PRESIDENT FECKNER: Welcome.

ACTING CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER HURLE: So for over the last three and a half years per Marcie's comment under Liana's control we've been improving and developing the discipline as well as the expectations of IT governance in project management.

Today what I'm going to have is Christian and Andrea are now going to take you through the governance actions and the activities that we do and how we perform. And then Tim and Anthony are going to work through on the F&O and what we've been doing with the functional

optimization.

So with that, I'm going to turn it over to Christian.

TECHNOLOGY BUSINESS MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF FARLAND: Good morning.

So when we talk about governance, we're talking really about three separate phases, the first of which is the concept how something goes from an idea to becoming approved project. So there's a whole level of governance that goes around that.

Then we're talking about the governance of, once something is a project, how do we manage that through to completion so that we get the outcome that we intended.

And then ultimately there's optimization, which is the investment we've made in that product or service, how do we ensure that it is as relevant on the day we retire it or sunset it as it was on the day we implement it? So there's also a level of governance that goes there.

So we're talking about today three separate really phases of governance.

Within those phases there are four levels. We have the foundation, which is the program level of governance; we have senior leadership, which is the next level of governance; executives; and then ultimately the

Board of Administration.

2

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

--000--

TECHNOLOGY BUSINESS MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF 4 FARLAND: Beginning with the foundational level, CalPERS has six program governance councils that we manage today. Each of them is specific to a particular set of business or needs. And those particular programs -- when I say program, I want to define that, because there's often confusion. In the portfolio world when we talk about program, we're talking about a set of similar projects --11 like projects that are grouped together for a similar 12 outcome.

So, for example, in our security program, we have three projects going on this year. Those three projects are with the intent of moving and maturing our security posture in the organization.

The focus in this particular program level is really about making sure that the decisions and recommendations here are about, you know, meeting the specific program needs and outcomes. So that -- I don't want to say tactical, but I'm going to say tactical where they're contributing to the overall strategy.

--000--

TECHNOLOGY BUSINESS MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF FARLAND: The next level is the senior leadership level. And this is a -- particularly the -- generally the same level or the same participants, but we change roles. So in this particular case, for example, I would take my division chief hat off - I'm no longer looking at my particular division, my particular program and needs - and I'm working with my partners across the organization to look at what are the enterprise needs. And so the level of responsibility and the breadth of the things that we take into account, strategically, et cetera, are evaluated at this level.

--000--

TECHNOLOGY BUSINESS MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF FARLAND: At the executive level, the third level, is really about approval authority. So at those lower levels we're making recommendations, and at the executive level it's really about the approval and frankly sponsorship of things as they go forward.

--000--

TECHNOLOGY BUSINESS MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF

FARLAND: And then, lastly, at the Board of

Administration, we're looking to you for strategic

guidance and input. And ultimately certainly you're -- we

just got done doing the budget approval. There's a

fiduciary responsibility and making sure that we're all

accountable on that front.

--000--

TECHNOLOGY BUSINESS MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF FARLAND: So I mentioned the three phases, and then I show you a slide like this that has four phases, which is the budget process, which is a whole different set of governance principles and responsibilities. I'm not going to go into any detail on that today. But I will point out a few points where that's where we touched that process or where that process touches the rest of our governance.

--000--

TECHNOLOGY BUSINESS MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF FARLAND: So we begin with a concept. And the whole process here is about moving from concept all the way through to an approved project.

And formally this process begins in March. We call it the BTPPP, or Business Technology Project Proposal Process. I won't refer to that because it's more than a mouthful and I'll stumble on it.

And submissions are due back from the different business areas in early April. And the first gate we go through here is management approval. So anyone can submit their proposal up through their management team. But the first step it goes through is a division chief. Division chief has to evaluate that to say, "Is this a value to my particular business, to my division? Is it going to, you

know, provide the outcome that I believe it's going to
accomplish?"

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

Then it has to go the deputy executive officer.

They ultimately have to sign off on it from a different level, the executive level, to say: Does this really meet where we're going? Does it help us achieve our enterprise strategic initiatives?

Once it gets into the process, we go into what's called the program decision. And so, as I mentioned, those six program committees each get a distribution of the relative projects or proposals that come to them. And they go through a very thorough evaluation, analysis, prioritization of those -- of those particular proposals, scoring them on a variety of things from risk, the different content, regulatory compliance, mission and goals, et cetera. And they provide that initial program prioritization. Based on that prioritization, it goes into a process again of analysis with business and IT representatives. We do alternatives analysis. In that alternatives analysis, we look at should we build, should we buy, is there something we can leverage in other organizations, is there something we can leverage internally that we're already doing so that we can maximize the benefit?

We're doing cost evaluations. We're looking at

all of resource to say, "Is this something that we can absorb? Are we organizationally ready?" There's a whole bunch of analysis that goes into that. And that process runs from May all the way through early July.

Once that's complete, it comes back to the program committees again. And they now have more information to perhaps go back and rerank their information or rerank their proposals. And at this point this is where you'd see the first -- really the first time where a lot of the proposals might drop out, they may be withdrawn, because the value wasn't there that we thought was going to be there, the cost benefit isn't necessarily there. And so that's the first sort of the -- the third -- really the third gate that we go through.

Those groups then make their recommendations, and those go forward to the senior leadership. Every other week there's a group -- there's a senior leadership group called the senior leadership council that meets. But in this particular case, the late July meeting is dedicated to again reprior -- or prioritizing, using the same criteria, now collectively all of the proposals that have come forward into the organization.

And so based on that, they're now looking at all of the information across the enterprise. And again, we've taken off our division chief hats, our program hats,

and we're looking at what is best for CalPERS.

That team makes recommendations then to the executive committee, which we call the IT Governance Council. We meet five times a year. And the August meeting then is dedicated to the discussion of these proposals as they come forward. And they evaluate the overall cost and things about these things. And this is really where the approval happens, the approval to proceed.

Now certainly, there's -- you know, funding is still a question. And so that's where their approval results in these proposals coming forward into the budget process which initiates in September, October time frame. And that's really the first touchpoint. That's really where you begin to see these things. You'll see them in the budget book. It goes through a whole level of governance around that and reevaluation of costs and things between that point in time and then when you see that in first and second readings. But that's the next level of approval.

Typically when we go through this process, on an average year we get 30 to 40 of the concepts come through. After it goes through the first couple of gates, you know, we've reduced that, we've combined things, we're down to 7 to 10. And so by the time you see things in the budget

book, it's around 3 to 5, sometimes a little more, projects that are moving forward for consideration.

--000--

TECHNOLOGY BUSINESS MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF FARLAND: So that bounces us back out to the overall governance lifecycle. We talked about enterprise governance. We talked about the budget process.

So let's jump into project governance. So this is where a project has been approved. Approved, it's been funded. Now it's time to execute, it's time to deliver on the promise that we made.

And so this is really -- a focus here is on monitoring and controlling. It's -- we're focusing on managing the work again to make sure that what was promised in the concept, in the proposal, we're delivering on the other end within scope, schedule, and budget.

But that's not the only thing. At the end of this we also do a post-implementation evaluation. So there's a whole evaluation of not only how well did we run the project, how well did we do from a management perspective, but there's an evaluation of did we receive what we intended to receive at the end? So there's a measurement perspective on that.

--000--

TECHNOLOGY BUSINESS MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF

FARLAND: With that, I'm going to turn it over to Andrea to talk a little bit about project oversight.

TECHNOLOGY BUSINESS MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF SPEARS: Thank you, Christian.

So at CalPERS we are a very structured process for project governance and oversight. And it really emphasizes the strong partnership between the business and IT so that we have a shared accountability and leadership.

All of our projects, each of them has an IT and a business project sponsor that ensures governance and decision making at the highest level. And in addition, an IT and a business co-director who work together to make certain that the project is guided and directed at a more tactical level. And a great example of this really is the partnership between the Actuary Office and IT Services Branch under the AVSRE project, which Christian's going to give you a few details about later.

All projects have formal steering committees.

And in those steering committees they meet monthly, they guide and direct the projects to ensure that they understand the progress and that issues are managed and that risks are managed.

They have a dedicated project manager, who is dedicated to managing the work and the resources to make sure that the project delivers on those project

objectives.

All of our projects are managed in accordance to our -- with our project management policy, which really uses a managed process to determine the level of project oversight and project management rigor that's required for each of our projects. And that's really dependent upon the size of the project, the amount of risk, and its complexity.

In addition, we use the CalPERS project management methodology itself, which is a formal process that is in very close alignment with industry best practices, with the Project Management Institute, and with our statewide California project management framework.

Also, we -- all of our projects are required to use our standardized project management tool so that we are capturing our metrics and our project status in a very consistent way for project reporting and governance.

So we use all these measures to make sure that we can maintain our focus on some very particular things.

Our biggest focus is making sure that we are achieving our project goals and objectives and we're delivering business value for the IT project investment.

We want to make sure that we're managing and controlling our scope, schedule, and budget. I mean, that is something that we do with all projects. And we're

making sure that the organization is really ready and prepared to take on the change that that project will bring. Through organizational readiness assessments, and through our organizational change management.

And then at the end, we're making sure that we're managing project risks; you know, making sure that there are solid mitigations in place, managing issues and managing change. So that in the end we're delivering what was promised under the project and we're keeping on track.

--000--

TECHNOLOGY BUSINESS MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF SPEARS: Thank you, Christian.

In terms of monitoring and controlling. So what I just described to you is really the internal project governance that's happening during that monitoring and controlling phase. But there's a lot of governance and oversight that occurs outside really of the scope of the project. And what you see here on this chart are some of the entities or the governance entities that are involved.

The program steering committees are focused on achieving the program strategies and objectives. And they're overseeing our project portfolios and making sure that good decision making is happening on those committees. We have project steering committees that really are there to make sure that we're delivering the

business outcomes and the value that are needed by those program steering committees to be successful.

And in addition to that, we have the project sponsors who represent their IT projects to these committees to ensure that there's good solid representation for governance and oversight.

In terms of our senior leadership at the enterprise level, what we do is we do reporting to the senior leadership council on a regular basis to make sure that they understand what projects are in the hopper right now, what are the active projects we're doing today, how well are we doing those projects, what's the value that we're delivering, and what is the status of those projects.

Our executive leaders are kept in the loop through the IT governance council. The IT governance council meets about five times a year. More if we think -- you know, if they think or if we think that it's needed because we need to place more focus on a particular project.

They receive reporting on our IT Project Health portfolio. And in particular, we provide additional focus on any projects which have a project health status of yellow or green. And at times those projects require a bit more focus and we have some lengthy discussions about

that, and receive direction from them in terms of what to do on those projects.

Finally, we provide reporting on a quarterly basis to the Board, making sure that under our CIO report and to the Finance and Administrative Committee that we're providing you that information on our portfolio health.

And actually Christian is going to give a little bit more detail on that, as I turn over our talk to him to talk about key governance decisions that are happening on our project.

--000--

TECHNOLOGY BUSINESS MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF
FARLAND: So Andrea referenced the actuarial valuation
system redesign and enhancement, otherwise known as AVSRE.
And I think that's a really good example of where this
project oversight has really been effective in the
organization.

As she mentioned, we have the structure in place, we have the co-sponsors, we have the co-directors, we have the steering committee made up of members of the Actuarial Office, ITSB, and the Financial Office. And we have the dedicated project manager.

And over the life of this project there have been some really good collaborative decisions made that have come from the structure and rigor. For example, one of

the things that the project did was bring in an independent third party to perform a readiness assessment. And in that readiness assessment they identified some things, both on the business end and IT, that were risks to that project being successful.

And so the project took those things on, both -the governance committee decided to address those things
to ensure that success. And so we pursued those,
mitigated those risks, while at the same time continuing
some of the critical path activities so that we could stay
on course.

Secondly as a result of that assessment, it was an opportunity for the team and particularly the customers to go back and reassess what it took to be successful in that. So you -- I believe you would have seen about last August a restructure of that project. And we've reduced that project from a five-year project down to a three-year project.

All of those things happened while there was going through some organizational change within the Actuarial Office. So the structure and rigor that we had in place ensured that there was a -- you know, a backup to all of this and decisions could continue to get made in an appropriate fashion so that we could continue the project on schedule.

And then lastly, from a long-term sustainability perspective, this co-ownership responsibility really contributed to a decision for us to move the development of this particular project into Java as opposed to Fortran. This allows us the ability to maintain this -- develop and maintain the system in house with Calpers staff, as opposed to -- and reducing our reliance on consultants long term that we've been doing in the past.

So some good successes as a result of AVSRE.

--000--

TECHNOLOGY BUSINESS MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF FARLAND: I want to move to the reporting that we do for you. And on a quarterly basis Andrea mentioned that we provide the CIO quarterly report. And we've made some changes to that report in the information we've provided to you over the last couple of months. And the latest rendition is some examples of what you see.

Attachments 3 and 4 are some specific examples that we've added the content that we've heard from you. But what we're going to be adding into each of your reports every quarter is this enterprise project dashboard. It's a quick oversight, a summary of the portfolio that has the start and end dates, have the total budget, total expended to date, and overall health status.

So as Andrea mentioned, at the executive level we

focus on those projects that are in a yellow or a red state. Those are the ones that need our attention. If it's green, things are generally going fine. There may be something that we're looking at. But you'll have that in the backup reports behind that.

But if it's yellow or red, that's where we really need to pay attention. And so those are the things that you'll see on the enterprise -- or on the dashboard.

And then, like I said, there are two examples in your packet, attachments 3 and 4, of a project that is in a green state, which is AVSRE, and a project that is in a yellow state. And you'll see some additional information about the risks and what's contributing to that status and what we're doing to particularly mitigate those risks and issues in the content of those particular reports.

So that's what we'll be doing going forward.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER HOFFNER: If I could take a second there, Christian, just chime in a little bit.

The reporting and discussion about things that are yellow, red status is really going to coincide with the work we're talking about at our July offsite in terms of enterprise performing management and measures. And so the -- that's really going to have the consistent feel for the Board reporting across both strategic and operational

dashboards that we'll be sharing with you and getting your input on.

So in terms of the timing and how this look and feel will play itself out, we definitely want your input but it's also going to coincide with that presentation then and input at the July offsite. So very much a cohesive presentation going forward.

--000--

FARLAND: So the project's done. It's delivered what it promised, it delivered it on time, it delivered it within budget. But we've made an investment in that system or that product. And so just like your house, you don't just buy the house and let it deteriorate over time and then hope that you get to the end of the life of that home. You're continually investing in that. You might redo the kitchen, redo the yard, those kinds of things that are improving the value and making sure that it still is relevant the day you move as the day you purchased it. And so we do the same thing with projects.

So this is a typical post-implementation lifecycle. And there's governance around this as well.

You know, coming out of the implementation, like I said, we've done the post-implementation assessment. So we're looking at those things that potentially could be

done in addition. We're stabilizing.

But what are those things that we need to do to optimize? And so we'll be talking in a moment about an example of where we did optimizations, the my|CalPERS optimization project where we continued that investment. But that's not to say -- enhancements are going to go on through the lifecycle of this -- of the entire life of the particular project. So you'll see -- this is how it goes.

--000--

TECHNOLOGY BUSINESS MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF FARLAND: An example of that governance that we've provided, as I mentioned, is my|CalPERS optimization. We ran this as a project, because there were a lot of things that we found we could do to optimize them. We've done a lot of really fantastic implementations as a result of this.

Back in 2014, you would have seen the presentation on what we had proposed around this project. This was back in February of 2014. Then we came to you for that budget proposal. And then from thereafter, as we mentioned, you get the quarterly reports. And then in November of 2015, Donna Lum and Liana Bailey-Crimmins provided you a status update on the project as well as some of the benefits realization. And we've continued to provide you the quarterly reports.

And today we have Anthony Suine and Timothy
Taylor here to give you an additional update on that
project and some of the benefit realizations that we've
made.

--000--

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER HOFFNER: I just want to interrupt and see if there's any questions before we go to the second phase of the presentation.

PRESIDENT FECKNER: Ms. Mathur.

BOARD MEMBER MATHUR: Thank you, Mr. President. I do have a few questions.

First of all, I just want to say this has been so far a very -- and I'm sure it will continue, a very -- (Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER MATHUR: -- a very cogent and thoughtful presentation, and I really appreciate all the -- I really appreciate the sort of robust process that you all have laid out. I do have a few questions though.

One is sort of the preconcept phase when you're sort of developing those concepts. What is the ideation process? How do you come up with the concepts? To what extent do you involve the entire IT team, or, you know -- could you just talk a little bit about that.

TECHNOLOGY BUSINESS MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF FARLAND: So projects -- when we're talking about this

whole process, these are really business technology projects. So I refer to the business technology project planning proposals. It's really about how IT can help facilitate the business functions.

So a number of things can come out of the business plan. Some of these can be part of the strategic plan. Some of these can be business process problems that come out of the business area. In some cases -- and the reason we have the different program committees is -- you know, for example, IT. There are things that we need to do in IT to keep the foundation correct. So we'll come up with projects there looking at the lifecycle of systems, things like that, looking at the industry, that will create some projects there.

Investments will have investment specific. The enterprise project -- or enterprise group does things or presents things that are more broad in nature that affect the rest of the organization.

Pension and health typically is more my CalPERS. But the actuarial project as well as the CEC project that you've seen in the current portfolio falls in there.

So it -- they come from a variety of different areas based on business need.

BOARD MEMBER MATHUR: Okay. Thank you.

And then with respect to -- so with respect to

project implementation, I have a couple of questions.

One is, to what extent do we collaborate with other state agencies and departments where there might be crossover where something we are doing might have some value elsewhere as well? And how do we identify those opportunities?

TECHNOLOGY BUSINESS MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF

FARLAND: So up front and before a project, we even

initiate the project, way up in that enterprise

governance, that's one of the things we're looking at, to

say, is, you know, rather than reinvent the wheel, "Is

somebody else already doing this?"

But we're also, you know, in constant contact with all of our peers within the State about the efforts that we're going -- we're very involved in those things -- and sharing our information so that they can reference that as well.

BOARD MEMBER MATHUR: Okay. Thank you.

And also with respect to implementation, if a -- if a project sort of has a hiccup, how do we make sure that the environment is such that it encourages sort of early identification of problems and early -- you know, addressing it early, is that a cultural thing or do you have a process that facilitates that?

TECHNOLOGY BUSINESS MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF

FARLAND: I'll let the other folks chime in. But my perspective is, we really stress identifying risks. So, you know, how extensive can we identify those risks early, so that, you know, there's not a -- it's not a judgment as to somebody did something wrong; it's, we anticipated these things and we put the mitigations in places so if and when they do arise, we are prepared and can respond to them.

BOARD MEMBER MATHUR: Okay. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT FECKNER: Mr. Slaton.

BOARD MEMBER SLATON: Thank you, Mr. President.

Very impressed so far with what you've presented. I spent 30 years observing and being involved in public sector IT projects. Some of them didn't go very well. I think, you know, government has a history of maybe not meeting expectations when it comes to IT projects. And I'm a firm believer that it is solely not a function of whether it's government or private sector. It's about governance, about oversight, it's about paying attention to the details; and also making sure that you're well coordinated with the operational side, so that you're not going off creating something that the operations side says, "Wait a minute, you didn't listen to what I had to say."

So it's very clear from what you have been saying

that we are addressing those kinds of issues. And in fact, delivering projects that are on time, on budget, and meet the expectations of the requirements.

So only one -- I only have one question. As I look at the dashboard, the completion dates -- you have eight projects listed, and five of those projects you have your completion date on a fiscal year boundary. Is that artificial? I mean why on a fiscal year boundary?

TECHNOLOGY BUSINESS MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF
FARLAND: For the most part I would attribute that to the
way that we fund the projects. They're funded on a yearly
basis. We're continually looking at, you know, our
estimation and how can we get that better. That's
certainly something we need to go look at. Thank you for
pointing that out.

BOARD MEMBER SLATON: Okay. Thank you.

Good work. Keep it up.

PRESIDENT FECKNER: Mr. Jelincic.

BOARD MEMBER JELINCIC: Yeah, you've raised a number of issues. And I'm going to ask the question. But if the answer is "Well, we're going to get to that," that's a perfectly acceptable response.

One of the issues you raised is that when we finish a project we do an evaluation. What are the results if the ex -- if what we were expected were not

there?

TECHNOLOGY BUSINESS MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF FARLAND: Certainly we would have to go -- I mean, that's when we go back into the lifecycle and say, "What else do we need to do? What additional investment do we need to make in that particular project?"

BOARD MEMBER JELINCIC: Okay. And I remember with CalPERS, which was a massive project, we contracted out a review, we contracted it out with the consulting firm that had a contract with the project people, and so that, you know, there was a certain conflict there.

So the -- but the other thing -- and let me point to -- it was on attachment 1, slide 15. But it's actually bigger on attachment 3, 531 of the iPad, "Business Benefits: Reduce hardware and software licensing; reduce business risk; improve customer service." How do you quantify those? I mean, we've got a budget here of, you know, \$3,700,000, and we've got in some ways very soft targets. And so how do you quantify that? And how do you really look at creating a return-on-investment calculation?

TECHNOLOGY BUSINESS MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF FARLAND: So each one of those is different. And I think we'll have some examples for you in -- when we talk about my Calpers in a little bit.

But, you know, one of the things that we -- that I can tell you is we're continually looking at how do we improve our metrics of those things and how do we drive better evaluation of that?

One of the things we put in place - and I think

Andrea mentioned it - is -- for the larger projects in

particular, we do what we call an internal feasibility

study where we're really looking at what are the cost

benefits and what are the changes in costs over time. So

what does it cost us to manage it today? What are we -
what does it cost us to manage it tomorrow?

We're evaluating, you know, as part of the alternatives analysis, what are the savings that we're going to be achieving? It's part of the questions up front in the submissions.

So I don't know if I answered your question, but...

ACTING CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER HURLE: Let me make a quick comment.

So a couple things on all three of the questions.

First of all, there is a level of diligence here based on each one as the project actually goes through the process itself.

Secondly, when you look at the summaries that have like "customer services improved" or there's a cost

savings in that, there is a diligence that goes behind that. Customer service could be either a speed to an answer. It could be a result on a more -- I was about to say robust, but I won't say it -- more complete answer. And that there can be offered to the member, it could be a member self-service improvement. So there are details in that. And so I think some of that might need to -- in order to satisfy some of the questions on how we get into that intimate detail. And I think there will be some good examples and Anthony will be able to represent it for you as well.

BOARD MEMBER JELINCIC: Okay. And the other observation I have is I think Priya raised the issue of how do we get things -- if things are going off track, how do we draw attention to it?

And it is not in fact our culture to bring problems forward. You know, it could be a little unpopular. It can be lonely. It can be isolating. It can lead to, you know, some forms of harassment.

But that's really a cultural problem. As I've said for years, when we start awarding an APEX to somebody who brought a problem forward, we will have shown a change in culture. Because bringing those problems forward serves our members by drawing attention to it so that we can allocate the resources we need to fix it rather than

let it fester.

2.4

ACTING CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER HURLE: What else I want to follow your lead. I mean, there's been -- I think the questions that have come to us to challenge something what we're doing with our governance. I think there's other challenges. I think we even talked about the security. Those challenges require us to come to you and be more transparent.

I will tell you that culturally it's difficult to bring a problem forward because of the, to your point, the unpopularity of it. I will tell that Liana had a different approach on how she established that culture, and I think that culture's evolving.

I will say also, in just my short period of time here, what I watch the teams do is that they do bring the problems forward. We do have to be careful. As leaders, you can react inappropriately, and then that shuts it down. So we have to keep catching ourselves.

But as of right now I would say your culture's evolving.

And to your point, I hope you do get an APEX that comes that way. But I do think that we're on the track for it.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER HOFFNER: As follow-up.

I think a good example would be the AVSRE. As it was

mentioned earlier without the specific details, as we launched into that project, we had significant senior leadership change. Our chief actuary retired. From a people and process perspective, we brought a third party entity in to help us evaluate that. So it was an independent evaluation to understand what those challenges might be. And then as we move forward, even with Mr. Terando in the acting role because it was right at the cusp of him taking that responsibility on, we had to shore up some things from a people process perspective in order to meet -- have a successful project launch.

And so I think, you know, we identified those things, we responded and reacted to them based upon the input from that third party. And I think we've put ourselves in a very good position moving forward. I think that's a very good example of how to take on those challenges as they emerge.

TECHNOLOGY BUSINESS MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF

FARLAND: I'll just chime in at the very end of this. And

I think one of the things that really brings it all

together is the fact that we have put this rigor in place.

And the more rigor we have, the more transparent we are;

and therefore the risk of bringing issues forward, the

risk of bringing problems forward, is lessened from a

personal perspective.

So the process is really set up to identify those things early and often so that we can address them before they truly become problems.

BOARD MEMBER JELINCIC: Thank you.

PRESIDENT FECKNER: Ms. Paquin.

ACTING BOARD MEMBER PAQUIN: Thank you.

Thank you for the report. I really appreciate hearing more about the governance programs, the IT projects.

I think somebody made the point of saying that one of the risk factors you're looking at is, will the business side be ready to implement using the new technology? So I was just curious. When does the training process start? Is it three months before implementation, or is it sooner than that? And what about post-implementation and training and usage issues?

TECHNOLOGY BUSINESS MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF FARLAND: So I think that's entirely dependent on the size and scope of the project. The particular project manager will build that in in conjunction with the program area into their schedule. So I don't know that there's a particular recipe for it, but we do take that into account as to what -- you know, how are we going to leverage existing training? Do we need internal training, external training?

For my | CalPERS we did an extensive pre-training and post-training for that as well. So...

ACTING BOARD MEMBER PAQUIN: Okay. Thank you.

PRESIDENT FECKNER: Mr. Gillihan.

BOARD MEMBER GILLIHAN: Thank you, Mr. President.

First of all, I was one of the people asking questions about your process. I just wanted to say, this is a thoughtful governance model that's entirely consistent with State standards and what you'd expect in a mature organization.

And I also appreciate the enhanced reporting, as one who's been asking for it.

The one thing I would ask that I don't see in there is if there's any dependencies between projects, if those would be included. And I think it's fair that if there's nothing said, that that implies there's no dependencies. But to the extent there is, that's helpful to know as well.

But otherwise I just wanted to commend you all on a good presentation and having a mature project governance model.

Thank you.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER HOFFNER: Thank you.

And that's something to take into account. We do have those discussions about the capabilities of both the

program and the technology teams as we look at these projects and the capability to take them on so we could have a line item in there, just have a discussion about those interdependencies should there be some.

Thank you for the feedback.

PRESIDENT FECKNER: Mr. Costigan.

BOARD MEMBER COSTIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Feckner.

Just a few points. I may have some comments when you're all done.

First of all, great report. I think fantastic.

As you all may know, I live in lots of different worlds, and I will just say the reputation of CalPERS, and particularly in a started or as continued is fantastic. I don't hear as -- CalPERS as a problem child, so to speak. I mean particularly in this space, you guys do fantastic work, do big projects. I know we've been critical over my|CalPERS in the past, more in the cost-containment issues.

But just a few questions that may -- you could touch on, some other was -- Ms. Mathur raised.

One, what's our role vis-à-vis DGS? I mean, talk about the T's and C's a little bit, which is one of the complaints I often hear on procurement contracts is that T's and C's are non-negotiable in the enforceability. How much is the problem for you? How big of an issue is

19130? Because this is one of the things I often see on IT contracts is personnel versus actual technology. I mean -- and I think sometimes the rest of the Board may not understand all of it because this one of the difficulties: You know, is it a software? Is it consulting? Is it technology? Is it billing up -- which is it?

I would like a little expansion on the Amy Tong, how we're interplaying with Department of Technology. And I know we're not governed by many of the same rules.

And also the play with Mr. Kim and his staff at DGS on the procurement side.

Just a little expansion, because I think part of -- your discussion used to be how difficult this is.

And then with all respect to Mr. Jones, we often talk about how difficult it is with the Investment Office in recruiting. I actually understand more in your world of how difficult it is actually to recruit and get someone like Ron from Intel; because as much as we're going to compete with the Goldman Sachs of the world on the investment side, we're competing with the programmers in Facebook and Twitter and Yelp who aren't sitting here in ties in front of us answering questions, and they're playing pool instead in their spot with their dog. And that's the -- so I'd like you all to expand. I didn't see

that in the presentation. We don't often get to hear from IT. But I think it's important to talk about some of the other barriers you are facing. Again, contracting out the T's and C's and recruitment. And I just didn't see that in the presentation. So...

Mr. Hoffner.

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER HOFFNER: So I'll start with I guess T's and C's. So as you know, we have a whole contracting team that Ms. Malm runs and operates here from like a procurement technology contracting perspective. We have our own set of terms and conditions that model what the State does. We've gone through several terms and conditions reviews. I think I started here nearly five years ago. It was one of the first things I know we saw on the minds of a lot of participants, not just in the technology arena, in terms of doing business with us. And so we actually put together an overview of sort of a risk assessment in terms of the type of contracts we do, based upon what we have in our standard terms and conditions.

And there was various things - I think three popped out - to be the most common challenges for vendors, again not just with IT but with us. And we looked at how to reduce the level of -- it's actually increased the level of rigor but look at how we applied those terms and conditions so that they were more appropriate to the types

of work that we're doing. We had some language about everybody has to adhere to the fiduciary standards even if it was a contract for, you know, software, right, or something.

So it didn't apply to the sort of rules that were there.

We have frequent discussions with the Department of General Services; the state agency, Government Operations, the teams there. I know the teams here work a lot with the leadership with the Department of Technology and our sister agencies. So there's a lot of that dialogue occurring right now.

In terms of processes, we definitely exchange lots of information with them.

And then you turn -- your question about in 19130 and with the contracting, we have to look at what the necessity of a project will entail. And really the goal here - and I think Ms. Frost mentioned this in a prior discussion in one of her comments as the CEO report, is how do we build the capabilities of the team. Right? And sometimes we're able to do that, sometimes with a skill set, and sometimes we need to further enhance and develop that.

And really the goal of these projects at the end of the day is for us to be able to maintain, operate, and

enhance our own projects and our own systems and technologies that we have here at CalPERS. If that's not necessarily possible in every case, then we have to go out and seek the necessary support, which may get into recruiting issues and challenges. But that's something we're striving to do. And as you'll hear in a later presentation, there's been a significant effort on knowledge transfer. We've embedded language about knowledge transfer in all of our contracts. We've done that for the last three years in order to help ensure that we have the capabilities internally from those consultants we've had to use historically to transfer that over to us. And so there's an added feature we've added a couple years ago to the projects going forward.

Recruiting's always a challenge. It's a challenge for us, the private sector, our sister agencies. You know, we would say we are a destination employer. We think we have a leg up in some respects. But it's always going to be an opportunity to overcome whatever those hurdles are going to be.

So we have used consultants. I think the model would be to essentially look for a skill set if we do not have it, but try to get off the reliance of individual consultants as best we can going forward. And that's just not with technology. That's in other arenas around this

organization, and that's part of our mission to be less complex and more efficient in our resources.

ACTING CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER HURLE: And I always have to take opportunity here once again, just at the example at the table here. We are very fortunate. We may have challenges in recruiting. But the team that we have in place is really solid. And even the example of the report we just gave today and that, so you always have to do a plug for the team that we already have. And we definitely want new people, but the team that's in place right now does excellent work.

BOARD MEMBER COSTIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Feckner.

PRESIDENT FECKNER: Thank you.

Ms. Taylor.

BOARD MEMBER TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. President.

So I know we have more to go, but I just wanted to ask a couple of additional questions.

But first I wanted to say that I'm also very impressed with the project governance model that you guys have proposed here.

And as an employee of an agency that has gone through several large IT project governance models,

Ms. Paquin talked about when you start your training process. But I think one thing that I didn't see in here was -- and maybe that's because it's a little too

granular. But your change management. Because as your users start to, you know, use it after they're trained, the change management has to come in because people aren't real cool with change. So I don't -- I'm sure it's, you know, part of it. And this may be just too granular for you, but I would love to hear you address that a little bit.

TECHNOLOGY BUSINESS MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF
FARLAND: Sure. And I don't recall exactly which page,
but when we were talking about the structure of the actual
project governance itself, that is one of the things that
we take into account and that's one of the things that we
ask of our project managers to build into their plan is
what is the change management strategy? Virtually every
project's going to need it.

BOARD MEMBER TAYLOR: Right.

TECHNOLOGY BUSINESS MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF FARLAND: Like you said, the people don't like to change. And so that is one of the things that we ask them to build in. In fact, many of the smaller projects that I can think of recently, that's been almost a bigger part of what we focused on than some of the true implementation because, I don't want to say it's easy, but sometimes the change is harder.

BOARD MEMBER TAYLOR: Exactly.

68

```
1
             Okay, great. Thank you.
             PRESIDENT FECKNER: Seeing no other requests.
 2
 3
             Mr. Suine.
             ACTING CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER HURLE: Are you
 4
5
    sure you want to go now?
6
             (Laughter.)
7
             PRESIDENT FECKNER: I'm sure he wants to go, but
8
   he doesn't want to talk.
9
             (Laughter.)
10
             BENEFIT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF SUINE: Aren't we
   out of time?
11
12
             (Laughter.)
13
                              --000--
14
             BENEFIT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF SUINE: Hopefully
15
    it's not all downhill from here.
16
             So this is a great opportunity to talk about one
17
    of the projects that was approved through the governance
   process, and that's the my CalPERS Functional Optimization
18
    Project. And I'd like to share a little more detail about
19
20
    the initiatives that we have implemented through the
   project and some of the benefits that we realized as a
21
   result.
22
23
                              --000--
24
             BENEFIT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF SUINE: Christian
25
    shared a version of this slide earlier that was a more
```

general overview of the project lifecycle. This slide is more specific to the Functional Optimization Project. And this actual slide was presented to the Board in February of 2014 when we set out to launch the project.

This slide, actually these are the original goals that we set out to accomplish in our project initiatives, including customer service improvements, reductions of risk, making our operations more efficient, and streamlining our back-office business processes.

As we launched the project, these goals helped us prioritize the initiatives we would set out to accomplish throughout the project. As Ms. Mathur brought up about how do these ideas get generated. And these -- this is a good example of -- these were really homegrown initiatives within the Functional Optimization Project. As Christian mentioned, the business drove many of these projects.

--000--

BENEFIT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF SUINE: And then to translate it back to some of the other questions about change management and training, because they were homegrown, they were ready for the change, they wanted some change, they had an opportunity to experience my|CalPERS for about two years and then were id -- easier to identify some of the needed changes that could make their lives easier. So that's a great thing.

And then a lot of the training would be incorporated to our individual program trainings in our respective program areas. And so that they could roll it out to all the team members through their normal training process.

So we -- we looked at all of our initiatives that we accomplished throughout this project. And this chart shows four of the key categories of where we included those initiatives; and it's proportional to the budget that was allocated to each of these areas. So we have operational efficiencies, program directives, online services, and technical optimization, which we'll talk a little bit more in detail about. And then a portion of our budget was also allocated to knowledge transfer of our IT staff, which Tim will talk about in a little bit. And then a portion of the budget was support and oversight for the project.

These -- these goals helped us -- the goals helped us prioritize our projects as well.

--000--

BENEFIT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF SUINE: So as we get into each of these categories a little more specifically, these drove which initiatives would rise to the top, because always the program area, as the IT folks will tell you, have way more demand than they can satisfy.

So we have to go through a prioritization process, and these goals helped us get there.

So operational efficiencies were our largest allocated initiatives, and these initiatives were focused on improving our business processes and our program areas.

And so while the return on investments, we really looked at risk reduction and improved customer service in streamlining those business processes; but as a result, we did recognize cost savings even though that was not an initial driver of operational efficiencies.

So each of these initiatives that we did had some impact on reducing permanent-, temporary-, and limited-term positions, over 160 of those in the last few years, which equated to a \$12 million savings.

So these initiatives helped us get through that -- get through that transition.

Some of the specific -- as Mr. Jelincic said, it is hard to really categorize what the dollar value is on risk reductions and customer service and streamline business processes. But we look to our audit findings: Have we resolved audit findings? We look to our service levels and what we're improving there. And then also our stakeholder surveys, like Ms. Mathur mentioned earlier, and the feedback from our stakeholders and how we're doing to try to gauge that we're getting that return on

investment.

And just also internally. So, for example, in risk reduction, our final compensation initiative that we implemented reduce significant risk by eliminating many manual overrides and manual calculations that the team had to do in calculating a benefit. When final compensation was incorrect, we used to exchange emails, and then had to manually calculate the end result. We implemented this initiative where valid final compensation amounts could be input into the system, and then the automated calculation could happen, eliminating those overrides and manual worksheets.

In the area of improved customer service -- we talk a lot about our replacement benefit plan and some of the issues, but we were able to make significant customer service improvements. These initiatives help us transition our participants in this plan from getting paid quarterly to getting paid monthly. It also improved customer service by expediting the invoices that were going to our employers, allowing them to pay earlier, and therefore us turning around and paying our participants in this plan earlier.

And then the Redesign Medicare Process initiative saw us take a manual process of mailing letters to those members who were age eligible for Medicare and asking them

to return those letters to us even though it was a mandatory opt in process. This allowed us to electronically opt those members in and eliminate a significant burden on our internal team as well as our membership.

--000--

BENEFIT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF SUINE: In the area of program directives: Program directives were driven by legislation or Board policy or compliance issues and were able to be accomplished throughout the life of this project because of the bandwidth of the Functional Optimization Project.

One in particular, the single Medicare payee where we migrated many of our Medicare individuals into united, this helped us with a cost savings of over \$21 million annually that were seen in the premium savings to our members and employers.

The accounts receivable initiative helps us reduce the risk of delinquent employers by tracking their receivables by their member population as opposed to them kind of self-reporting the receivables that they owe us.

And the retirement options simplification initiative allowed us to reduce the complexity of the number of retirement options from 13 to 7. This helped us do all that internal functionality and integrate the

system so that we can focus on those most financially sound options for our members.

And lastly, our interest payment initiative improved customer service by providing us the authority and ability to pay interest on delayed benefits when the member is deserving of those interest payments.

--000--

BENEFIT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF SUINE: The enhancements of online services. We saw a number of initiatives that added or improved functionality for our customers to do business with us on line. One area of cost savings was the million dollars annually that we will be saving by transitioning our members for the second year now into the online health statements, providing them more relevant information on line and easier access to that and not mailing those statements.

We have also allowed our employers to more easily track and manage their receivables on line through our member self-service, which is reducing the risk of timely payments or less timely payments and really getting those funds into our system faster.

And then enhancements to our home page have improved the customer service to our members who use our online functionality.

It's given them the functionality to get to what

they need to more easily on line and make things more accessible to them.

And then lastly, we streamlined our internal business processes by offering a new member self-service function called modification of life option beneficiaries. And this is where our retirees can now go on line, and if they have a life event such as a divorce or a new marriage, they have the opportunity through the law to change their benefit option. They would mail these requests in. And ultimately it can be expensive, so they often choose not to elect those. Now they can go out on line -- this was just implemented recently, and we're already seeing where they're going out there, they're getting their cost estimate themselves. And then that when they choose not to elect, it didn't relate in any back-office work. So it's really streamlined our business processes.

So with that I'm going to turn it over to Tim to talk about the benefits of our technical optimization improvements and discuss the next steps.

ENTERPRISE SOLUTIONS DEVELOPMENT DIVISION CHIEF TAYLOR: Thanks, Anthony.

--000--

ENTERPRISE SOLUTIONS DEVELOPMENT DIVISION CHIEF

25 | TAYLOR: In addition to numerous business functional

optimizations, we also wanted this as an opportunity to invest in technical optimizations as well.

I'm going to take the slide a little bit out of order. When we saw the breakdown of where the budget was fundamentally partitioned out for the various aspects, there was a "knowledge transfer" slide.

When my | CalPERS originally implemented and we were going through that two-year stabilization period, we have a -- we had a heavy reliance on consultants, not just from a capacity standpoint but, more importantly, from a capability standpoint; which was a concern for us. So the first two years of this project of functional optimization effort was to really invest in that knowledge transfer to wean ourselves off of requiring that -- that capability dependency on consultants.

So we had a sizable budget. We did a lot of cross-training, a lot of different channels in which we were able to educate existing staff in order to maintain the system, create on-boarding programs to ensure that not only were we transferring knowledge to existing resources, but we were bringing that into the enterprise; so when we did suffer any sort of turnover, we had the ability to bring new folks up to speed.

Through that, we've witnessed a reduction in consultants. We'll have seen a reduction of 35 by this

June 30th. We have been rolling consultants off throughout the life of the project, but as of June 30th we'll be up 35. And at the end of the calendar year we'll be reducing another -- an additional 11.

Knowledge transfer is also important not just for understanding what was in the system at the time that we took ownership of it. But we also recognize the fact that as we're pursuing these new functional optimization aspects, that we needed to ensure that knowledge transfer is occurring there. And so we actually approached this exercise very differently than the original my|CalPERS situation.

Previously we had a lead integrator. We let them do what they wanted to do, and then we shared acknowledge after the fact.

This approach reemphasized a blended team approach. Even though we had a primary systems integrator, every single initiative team, every single effort that we've done is done in a blended fashion. So all disciplines that are contributing to a particular initiative, whether they're analysts, testers, developers, architects, it's blended. We have CalPERS representation on all those efforts. And at the moment, we actually lead 50 percent of the functional optimization initiatives with State resources. So we're sharing that with the

consultant as well. And so that dovetails nicely with our reduced reliance on consultants.

We also had specific initiatives that we wish to tackle to ensure sustainability to reduce complexity. A couple notable ones were when we inherited the system there was a lot of third-party software that the system relied upon and it was tightly integrated with the overall system. So we've spent this opportunity to wean ourselves off of those third-party reliances as well. We've removed a third-party business processing language for work-flow management. It was an internally managed activity for us to do so. We've converted it to a non-proprietary solution, into an open standard solution. And by doing so, we've reduced our reliance on purchasing software both one time and annual.

We also have -- are in the process of removing our rules engine. We're replacing that with on open standard as well. That is another State-led initiative.

Both of these activities, not only do they reduce the number of technologies that we have in play, but it also allows us to no longer have a very specialized knowledge need. Before the two solutions required highly specialized skills that would be difficult at times for us to recruit for, and then difficult for us to retain those positions. In doing so, now we have a standard that we

can have a larger team maintaining those systems; and collectively they've resulted in those cost savings there.

A lot of the optimizations that we've done to date too has allowed us to reduce our number of limited-term or blanket positions. We've done 14 through the first three years of this project.

And all of the -- cool stuff?

And Anthony wanted me to remind you that the teams allow our employees to work on cool stuff as well.

(Laughter.)

ENTERPRISE SOLUTIONS DEVELOPMENT DIVISION CHIEF

TAYLOR: So it's not just the consultants that get to work
on the cool stuff.

But we really -- it's been mentioned before, recruitment's difficult, retention is difficult. We recognize that. And so the blended team format and the opportunity for them to work on more compelling activities, cutting-edge activities is one of the things that we can do in order to attract and retain those folks.

--000--

ENTERPRISE SOLUTIONS DEVELOPMENT DIVISION CHIEF TAYLOR: So the final funding of this project budget was approved. We're in the final year. The project ends at the end of -- or the fiscal year of 2018, June 30th, 2018. So our next steps from a functional optimization

standpoint is: We have seven releases currently scheduled. We have all the initiatives that have been identified as part of the functional optimization slotted for each of those. We have teams actively working to complete those.

And then we'll continue to track the project through the governance model attrition that Andrea spoke of earlier.

--000--

TAYLOR: Once we complete the functional optimization period, however, we'll have end the typical optimization portion of the system lifecycle. But as has been mentioned, there will always be an ongoing need for enhancements, a need to continue to make notable investments in order to ensure sustainability and viability of a solution, and so we'll be monitoring future needs collectively.

Thank you. And if you have any questions, we'll --

PRESIDENT FECKNER: We do have a few.

I'll start with one.

Mr. Suine, the enhancements going forward at the  $my \mid CalPERS$ , are they going to help catch the inaccuracies coming from the employers as well?

BENEFIT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF SUINE: Yes, we have initiatives that focus on the employers. And anytime we find any issues with those, I think those accounts receivable tracking will really help us in monitoring any risk in those areas.

And we do have several of the edits and audits built into their reporting functions, so we can catch as many of them as possible.

PRESIDENT FECKNER: Good. Thank you.

Ms. Mathur.

BOARD MEMBER MATHUR: Thank you.

Well, first let me just say I really appreciate the grounding in risk, which clearly is an area that we as an organization are focusing more and more on. But how do we mitigate the risks moving forward? And so I appreciate that that is such -- so fundamental to the work that you're doing.

My second question is with respect to large projects like my CalPERS, where obviously we invested quite a lot of money to deliver what we -- you know, a new solution that -- and integrating a number of legacy projects. Maybe this is really for you, Ron. But how frequently do agencies -- do you have to reboot or redo those types of big projects? How far can enhancements and refinements take you? Because obviously those legacy

82

programs were at one time state of the art. So I guess that's a more conceptual question.

ACTING CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER HURLE: Well, if I go back from history, it took us I don't know how many years to get rid of the mainframe at Intel. And so...

I'll let the team respond to it, because there are certain things that have started to turn archaic on you, other things you're going to have as far as the system that even the platform it sits on it starts to deteriorate on you, which causes you to move. There's going to be things you'll see that's going to change in your overall environment that you'll do enhancements for. And that's -- so...

But I'll let these guys think of what their -- what your think of a lifetime is for the sunset here on  $my \mid CalPERS$ .

17 ENTERPRISE SOLUTIONS DEVELOPMENT DIVISION CHIEF

TAYLOR: A long time.

19 (Laughter.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

20 ENTERPRISE SOLUTIONS DEVELOPMENT DIVISION CHIEF

21 | TAYLOR: A long time.

22 (Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER MATHUR: I'm not anticipating we need to do this any time soon. I'm just curious, you know. And then how do you plan --

ACTING CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER HURLE: It won't be tomorrow.

BOARD MEMBER MATHUR: -- for that in advance so that you don't end up having -- you know, it hits you in a very significant way over a shorter period of time?

ENTERPRISE SOLUTIONS DEVELOPMENT DIVISION CHIEF TAYLOR: So the short answer, actually the slides, the information on the slides. Well known. It's advertised quite a bit. There actually is a sunset time frame and it's around the 25-to-30-year mark. We pulled that out, because that's what's been observed over time.

But it gets back to this notion of -- Christian used the house analogy. I'll use a car analogy. If you are investing in the system to maintain it, if you are staying aggressive and diligent in ensuring that you're on top of all the maintenance activities and you're keeping everything up-to-date, you could extend that lifespan.

It's impossible to have, you know, a date in mind as to when something might become obsolete.

The other benefit is, the way systems are being architected today and the things we're attempting to do with my|CalPERS and decoupling all these things so they're discrete pieces, that if one piece becomes obsolete, you can replace that with the latest for a lower cost and more quickly, while you're keeping the rest of the system

running. And then when another piece then becomes obsolete a few years later, you can do that replacement.

The legacy systems were all entwined; and the minute it hit that age of passing, it was over.

5 BOARD MEMBER MATHUR: Thank you. That's very 6 helpful

ENTERPRISE SOLUTIONS DEVELOPMENT DIVISION CHIEF

8 TAYLOR: Sure.

PRESIDENT FECKNER: Mr. Jones.

VICE PRESIDENT JONES: Yeah, thank you, Mr. President.

Yeah, that was kind of a similar question I had, is the obsolescence of the system when you actually have to make a significant capital outlay to replace a major portion. And I was going to ask the question whether or not you look at it as an incremental funding process, so that when that time comes, you don't have to have this large outlay of capital but you can start funding it like two or three years in advance. If you know for sure you have a useful life of 25 years, as you indicated in your data -- and by the way time, Tim and Anthony, you're still on a roll. Congratulations.

(Laughter.)

VICE PRESIDENT JONES: Okay. And so that was one of my questions is this funding mechanism for these large

Go ahead.

capital outlays that can be, you know, done incrementally and it won't have the same impact.

the system.

And the second question I have is -- Rob touched on it in terms of business rules that you change. And I was wondering -- I know when my | CalPERS was -- you hit that button go and local agencies, the employers, say, "Wait a minute, I can't handle it." So I was wondering how do you keep them apprised of these changes going forward so that they won't have that outcry like we had when we pushed the button on my | CalPERS?

ENTERPRISE SOLUTIONS DEVELOPMENT DIVISION CHIEF TAYLOR: So I'll address the first part of your question, and then I'll let Anthony address -- or do you want to trade? You want to answer?

BENEFIT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF SUINE:

ENTERPRISE SOLUTIONS DEVELOPMENT DIVISION CHIEF TAYLOR: The way we go about funding significant enhancements - and it was mentioned previously before according to the slide - even once we implemented where we're introducing system changes, even during the course of functional optimization and the reason why we have so many capacity consultants, is the fact that there is day-to-day things that we need to do in order to maintain

So the little things we do to invest in keeping

86

- 1 it healthy, and sustainable does not always require a large investment or a large project. So what we typically 2 3 do is we identify those activities, we utilize existing 4 resources in order to provide the enhancements or 5 whatever, or maintenance activities we need to do for that 6 sustainability; and then strategically thinking we'll 7 reach out if we are aware that there's going to be a 8 significant technology shift or something's going to 9 become obsolete soon, we'll begin the process and we'll go 10 through the budget or the project's -- the BTPPP in making 11 a recommendation of what's necessary from an IT perspective: We need to do this. This is what we think 12 13 it's going to cost. And then when they're more notable, 14 they'll come through the budget process.
  - VICE PRESIDENT JONES: Yeah, because your house analyses that, when my roof go out, I can go get a loan. But, you know, you have to plan ahead. So...
- 18 ENTERPRISE SOLUTIONS DEVELOPMENT DIVISION CHIEF
  19 TAYLOR: Correct.

15

16

17

22

23

24

25

- DEPUTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER HOFFNER: Maybe I can inject a little bit.
  - So the other thing we did at that time was the Big Bang approach, right? So I think how we rolled this system out would be something that we've definitely learned from; and how we've done things differently going

forward from that point, it's more of an agile approach.

I just think, to your point, there's the cost side of it is also the people process side of it and change; and those things that we've learned from and we'd do differently going forward. So...

BENEFIT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF SUINE: To address the business partner question, Mr. Jones. We -- as these initiatives come along, right, they're not quite as large as what we attempted to do in 2011. And that was a huge transition. But we continue -- we have a CSOD -- customers outreach area has a business partner training team that goes out, I want to say almost every month, to our various regional offices, inviting our employers to learn about the new functionality in my|CalPERS and making sure they're prepared.

We also have a business partner support team that our employers have a direct line to to help them with technical issues with the system, answer any questions that they may have, and provide us ideas on how to enhance their experience.

And then we also have a team of division chiefs that do outreach through our employer response dialogues to let them know about some bigger things, like transitioning them all to electronic fund transfer rather than sending us checks.

So we're -- we use several mediums to transition that change for our employers and make sure they're well communicated to well educated and that we're responsive to their needs.

VICE PRESIDENT JONES: That's great. Thanks.

PRESIDENT FECKNER: Mr. Jelincic.

BOARD MEMBER JELINCIC: I want to make an observation that the INVO grad did good.

In 2004, I was appointed to the California

Performance Review; the last time I was ever appointed to anything by a Republican.

But one of the things that they did and -- they looked at IT functions. And they gave a lot of credit and used Virginia as an example. And so I reached out, you know. I've got a long history - this goes back to '04 - a long history of reaching out and looking for information that's not necessarily coming, you know, directly from staff; looking at other sources of information. So I talked to the head of their IT and asked, "Well, what did" -- you know, "they're telling us you did really good. What did you do?"

And his answer was, "We fired all the consultants and brought it all in-house."

Because the consultant comes in, does the job, goes away. And if it doesn't work, that's your problem,

and I'll be happy to come back for a change order.

The State employee has to live with the system. And if he doesn't or she doesn't have to live with it, their peers do. And their peers will come to them and say, "What did you do to me?"

Now, you know, that was 2004. You know, the State hasn't learned a lot from that. We're making some progress. But one of the things I wanted to emphasize is we really do need to figure out how to bring more of these projects in-house.

One of the things that we have in the budget is a significant amount of money for training. We are not spending our training budget. And that is not a good thing. We put it there so we can get the skill sets, so we can get the consultants out of here, so that we can have more internal control. And so if we need to train State employees, then we need to spend that money.

So off the soapbox.

But we recently did a recruitment fair. How did that go?

ENTERPRISE SOLUTIONS DEVELOPMENT DIVISION CHIEF

TAYLOR: What was the day? It was April 29th -- 28th?

So on April 28th we had our second ever ITSB

Calpers career fair. It followed the format very similar

25 to the first one that we had. But the climate was very

different this time.

The last time we did it, we had basically 99 vacant positions and there was a push to bring in a bunch of folks to help man some of these.

And entirely different situation now. At the time I believe we had about 8 or 9 vacancies. We had applied a lot of the lessons that we had learned from the first go-round. We had a good turnout: Approximately 500 folks, very diverse crowd, a lot of professionals down to recent grads or soon to graduate.

We set it up to where people can go and visit different disciplines within IT to learn more.

HR was great. They were on hand to coach people on the State hiring process, which is a difficult thing for us to do. They provided a lot of insight to these individuals. We collected resumes. Allowed us to build a little CRM system with prospective candidates, with the possibility of student position in -- student positionings becoming a possibility. There were some current students that would be interested in things like that.

It was very successful.

We do recognize the fact that we need a pipeline of talent. That was our intent this time, to get CalPERS out there identified as a destination employer, not just from a building perspective or that we have a gym, but the

fact that we do very sophisticated IT projects and we do invest heavily in our staff and we do have robust training plans within IT. And it gives us an opportunity to establish that.

BOARD MEMBER JELINCIC: And did we get some resumes from people that if we can get them on staff, we can get rid of a few more consultants?

ENTERPRISE SOLUTIONS DEVELOPMENT DIVISION CHIEF Yes.

BOARD MEMBER JELINCIC: Thank you.

PRESIDENT FECKNER: Thank you.

12 Mr. Costigan.

TAYLOR:

BOARD MEMBER COSTIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Feckner.

I'll go in reverse order.

You're in the unique position of having both CalhR and SPB on this Board. So from the standpoint of talking about recruitment, onboarding and all that, you have two Board members you can talk with, because we want to hear about it. I mean, as you know, Secretary Batjer really working on civil service improvement and onboarding. And so I again my very impressed that you had the IT followed on social media. You guys did a fantastic job.

I just -- I did ask our staff at SPB were we there. Just kind of one in the future, when you do an IT

recruitment, definitely having CalHR and SPB there because we can help sometimes folks understand the archaic process of trying to get in.

Maybe you all can expand a little bit on the difference between enhancement and display of information. Because here's a problem. And I've talked to Anthony about this.

I often struggle with the Cal -- the my|CalPERS.

And I don't want to use it as a "beat-up" today, but since it's been part of your presentation, I find it to be fairly static. It provides basic information to me: How long I've worked, whether I vested for defined benefit, and potentially what my benefit will be.

Where I struggle -- and we spend a lot of money, and this is where I wonder, is it enhancement, is it software issues? So, for example, if you go through and do a retirement estimate, unless you know -- so you get yours and then you get your spouse and your beneficiary. You have to know to add the two together. And I don't quite understand why it displays that way. I mean, in my example, my wife is my beneficiary. So why I get two columns on display? And I have never been told if we can fix that or not. And so is that an enhancement or a software issue, you know, from a...

Second, is why is it for purposes -- I've got to

quit pointing. Sorry. It's a bad lawyer trait. I'm trying not point. My wife said that to me the other night, "Don't point at me."

(Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER COSTIGAN: So the -- why is it that on the defined benefit it'll give me my vesting, for example; but when I click over to the health care side of it, it doesn't tell me where I've -- I know I'm vested because I have a letter from Anthony's team. But it doesn't tell me. So is that an enhancement or is that a display issue? Because that's the struggle, is we all know the formula to vest, right? You know, 5 years, 10 years, depending on what you are. But sort of the question -- and this is -- I raised this with Mr. McKeever before he left because when the health rates came out there was information that -- all the information wasn't in there. So I'm trying to reconcile to my Calpers for the other information.

So is that an -- because that's -- back to the analogy about building the house. We built the house.

Now we're just maintaining it. Or how do we expand, add a new deck, you know, what -- because when I look -- because I'm on the site right now. And It's fantastic, right? It tells me exactly how much I've contributed, my total service and credit, fact I can retire, and my formula.

But, again, when you click on "health," all it tells me is that -- currently what my premium is and that -- but I know I have vested, so...

And then I'll go a little further. We always talk about defined benefits. And what we provide here is part of a 3-legged stool towards retirement. We have no interface with Savings Plus. Now, is that a Savings Plus issue? As I told Director Gillihan, their site also is static for -- and I don't know -- this is a larger project about -- because you talk about spending and enhancements is. The Savings Plus program only takes the number I get and doesn't assume I get a COLA, doesn't assume any future increase, right? So it too is a little bit of a static model, but it updates my 401 and 457 on a daily basis.

So you've got -- for our members, who typically have a 401 or 457, a DB, we're not giving -- maybe that's not our job. But I just -- when I look at what we spend on this, my Schwab does a better job overall of helping me prepare for retirement than the information I get here. So how do we address that or what do we do?

And like on the health issue, why don't we have something on this that says I vested for health? Same formulas. Statute exist.

BENEFIT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF SUINE: So, it's an enhancement, the types of things you're referring to.

And as I mentioned, the demand just far outweighs the capacity. So we try to prioritize those things that are meeting all those criterias and goals to say which ones are going to benefit us the most.

So it's definitely something we want to look at and enhancing our member self-service tools. I think through the retirement option simplification we're taking another look at our member self-service functionality and our pages to optimize those.

You know, the health question in particular, you know this better than anybody, Mr. Costigan. It's easy to tell you you're vested for retirement. Right? Five years, you're age 50. Were you appointed in this fashion, were you appointed in that fashion, when did you come into membership?

BOARD MEMBER COSTIGAN: You have to produce that if -- if I were to retire today, you'd have to produce that information for me. So plan --

BENEFIT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF SUINE: Yes, but that would come to the back-office team to review that particular eligibility situation or you would meet with our regional office team to guide you through what you're health vesting is. So it's not as simple to display as, say, a retirement vesting where it's just two criteria. Right.

So the amount of criteria would go into enhancing the system to make sure we always get that information right when we display it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

BOARD MEMBER COSTIGAN: Well, and again -probably have a longer discussion. But here's, Mr. Suine, what I don't really understand from an enhancement standpoint is, each year that I get additional service credit the defined benefit side of the house updates it. If I have vested for purposes of health care, whether it was pre-1989, pre-'91, or pre-2000. So it's 50 percent, and in each addition. So we'll take a pre-PEPRA but after-2000 employee. 50 percent, plus 5 percent per year. So if you can tell me over here each year how much service credit I have, why can't you tell me over here on the health side -- because it's just a formula. I mean, you know that, because you tell me, I'm a miscellaneous employee in Bargaining Unit 50. I mean, you al --BENEFIT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF SUINE:

BENEFIT SERVICES DIVISION CHIEF SUINE:
Definitely.

BOARD MEMBER COSTIGAN: And that's why -- I'm -- and it's not picking on you. I'm just saying, I appreciate -- I just want to say how much I appreciate Anthony, because not many people get the opportunity to call him up and say, "Can you explain this to me" and walk it through.

And I know if I'm struggling, it's -- and I don't want you over -- well, and that's what I'm just trying to get at. We spend a lot of money, and at times I feel the system is fairly static. It just updates on a yearly basis what my retirement is. Doesn't provide me a lot of other information. And part of it I think is you all needing to again reinforce to everybody how much information flows in. I mean, all the employers, all the controller information. I know when we first had CalPERS -- excuse me -- my|CalPERS, we had a problem with communicating with the controller's office, just on some of the data coming in. We've worked through all that.

And then just last point - and I'll look to Ron - I think brain drain, you -- this is a conversation you have to have with the vendors, because one of the problems we had with my | CalPERS was the vendor decided, "Oh, look, shiny new object over here at Fi\$Cal. Oh, look, shiny new object over here at Covered California." And we saw the migration of folks go. And that is something I think that's -- back to Mr. Jelincic's points -- very important, both on the internal and the external, to work on that. And I am so glad, as Ms. Mathur said, when we're looking at risk, that's something that you guys are recognizing, because that is the big -- otherwise Anthony will keep getting phone calls from folks like me saying "Why doesn't

the system do this?" - without realizing having all the talent. So, anyway.

Thank you, Mr. Feckner.

ACTING CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER HURLE: And a couple -- I'm not sure, from maybe a closing comment. But -- so the first reason for the strategy of having the group here, rather than just one individual, is to show that there's steps, that there is more than just the process. There is an intimate -- if I consider with the actual systems and the process that go into play, there's a discipline that's in place in our governance.

I don't disagree with the consultant comment at all. I will tell you to live without consultants and have the speed that you need, and the swiftness you need, is probably an impossibility. I do think that -- to your point, that we have to reduce the reliance on them. If something has gone wrong, that's not their fault. It's that we screwed up in our governance, we screwed up in our project management. That's not going to happen. What we're going to do is pay attention to those disciplines; at the same time still utilize them in first capacity where we need them, and use the ones that have been good partners to us.

But I just want to make sure that it's not going to be going away, all of them and that. But we definitely

will do our best to do the reduction of the dependency.

But I do want to thank the team for the attention they paid to in giving you the representation they did today. They are a crack team, and we appreciate the time.

PRESIDENT FECKNER: Okay. Well, seeing no other requests, I do note you have a few slides left.

Mr. Hoffner, are you -- we're good?

All right. Well, thank you all for a great presentation. Appreciate it.

Brings us to Agenda Item 12 - State and Federal Legislative Update. Ms. Ashley, as soon as there's a seat available.

## LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF ASHLEY:

Hello. Good morning, Mr. President, members of the Board. Mary Anne Ashley, CalPERS team member. I will be presenting the State and federal legislative update. And the legislative summary is available in your Board materials for your reference.

The status of bills continues to change quickly. And several of the bills noted in the highlight section of the report have since been heard in the fiscal committees and have even been reported to the floor or been placed on the suspense file. The fiscal committees have until May 26th to hear and report to the floor all bills that were introduced in their house of origin. And June 2nd is the

last day for bills to be passed out of the house of origin.

I'm very happy to report that all four of our sponsored bills have passed both the policy and fiscal committee, and three of the four have since been moved to the second house and are awaiting committee assignment.

We continue to work with the legislative offices on other bills that we've identified as potentially impacting CalPERS. We have submitted amendments to Assemblymember Kalra's office regarding AB 20, which is on the Dakota access pipeline. The amendments are to address concerns that we have regarding a provision that was newly added to the bill that we believe could be viewed to be in conflict with the Board's plenary authority.

We are also working very closely with Senator Allen's office on Senate Bill 560 regarding consideration of financial climate risk assessment and reporting. And we anticipate that we'll submit amendments to his office later this afternoon.

We will keep the Board updated as the legislative session continues to progress.

And then on the federal level, our federal representatives provided their updates in their written reports. And the federal bills that we are monitoring are noted in the federal report section of the legislative

summary. Additionally, the federal representatives will be calling in a verbal report and update at the June committee hearings.

Two issues that we are closely following are the American Health Care Affordability Act -- I'm sorry -- and the Financial CHOICE Act 2.0.

In regards to the AHCA, the House passed their bill on May 4th. And the Senate officially cannot -- cannot officially start working on the bill until after the Congressional Budget Office has scored the bill with the House amendments considered. However, Senator Orrin Hatch, who is the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance, has indicated that the Committee is seeking input from key stakeholders that represent the interests of patients, providers, employers, and thought leaders.

CalPERS is currently in the process of drafting a letter to submit to the Committee, as we feel this would be a good time to go on record regarding several provisions of the bill.

Regarding the Financial CHOICE Act, the House Financial Services Committee concluded its markup of the FCA and reported the bill favorably to the full house for a vote, which is anticipated to occur around May 22nd. It is anticipated that the FCA will pass the house. And on May 12th CalPERS joined with the Council of Institutional

102

Investors as the signatory on a letter to all members of the U.S. House of Representatives strongly opposing certain provisions of the FCA, noting that the bill would weaken critical shareholder rights.

CalPERS team members are currently working on completing an analysis of the FCA. And additionally we have team members that will be visiting key capital offices in D.C. next week.

We will keep the Board updated on the FCA and the AHCA and other federal legislation as it moves through the congressional process.

And this concludes my update. And I am happy to take any questions.

PRESIDENT FECKNER: Thank you.

Ms. Taylor.

BOARD MEMBER TAYLOR: Yes, thank you,

17 Mr. President.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

I just had a -- I'm glad that we are having team members go and talk to folks on Capitol Hill about the Financial CHOICE Act. But I only heard that we're sending a letter for the AHCA. Are we actually going to be lobbying anybody on the AHCA on what we want to see kept in, what we --

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF ASHLEY:

That's to be determined still. We haven't

reserved our engagement activities until after it passed from the House to the Senate. So now we feel this would be a more appropriate time to start those types of activities.

BOARD MEMBER TAYLOR: Right. So you are strategizing around that right now?

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF ASHLEY: Yes

PRESIDENT FECKNER: Thank you.

I have one request to speak from the public. I have Ms. Martha Turner.

BOARD MEMBER TAYLOR: Okay. Thank you.

Please come forward to my left, and microphone will be turned on for you. You'll have three minutes.

Please identify yourself and your affiliation for the record please.

MS. TURNER: Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. My name is Martha Turner. And I'm with Fossil Free California. And I'm speaking with regard to State Senate Bill 560.

I last week had the opportunity to attend the National Climate Adaptation Forum. About a thousand persons in St. Paul who come together, both from the private and public sector, to address how we will functionally both in terms of infrastructure and also programmatically move forward with addressing climate

change.

And to my pleasant surprise, I noticed that -not just noticed. I was participating in the session
where SB 560 was raised in very favorable terms. And it
was raised in the terms of looking at what is happening in
France with regard to finance climate risk reporting. So
I wanted to share that with the Board. You may not have
heard that that was the case.

And I also wanted to -- in addition to that, to mention that one can look at SB 560 as a bill that is -- it might allow CalPERS to behave somewhat complimentary to what you recently -- the Investment Committee, I should say -- recently spoke very favorably with regard to Occidental Petroleum's board vote regarding climate scenario requirements for Occidental Petroleum. So in a sense, the idea of SB 560 can deepen and strengthen the work that CalPERS is already doing with regard to addressing internally and externally climate risks and take this farther and take it out into a more public forum.

So I, first of all, just wanted to mention that there is a very wide audience that is interested and very favorably disposed to languishing around SB 560 that is climate forward and climate supportive and also human community supportive.

And that this is an opportunity for CalPERS if the bill is -- moves through both houses and is signed by the Governor, it's an opportunity for CalPERS in a sense to say, "We're doing the duty just as when we do stakeholder engagement. The companies that we're invested in, we're asking them to do the duty as well."

So thank you very much.

PRESIDENT FECKNER: Thank you for your comments.

Brings us to Agenda Item 13 - Summary of Board Direction.

Ms. Frost, do you have any summary items?

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: I have one. That was Mr. Gillihan's request to add project dependency to the project score cards.

PRESIDENT FECKNER: All right. Very good.

Item 14 - Public Comment. I do have two requests to speak. I have Mr. Jim Auck and Bryan Snow.

Mr. Snow, you put Agenda Item 11. I assume you 19 meant 14.

MR. SNOW: Yes.

PRESIDENT FECKNER: All right. Please come forward, gentlemen, to my left.

Again you have up to 3 minutes. And identify yourself for the record, please.

MR. AUCK: Hello, Board members, Mr. President.

My name is Jim Auck. I'm the president of the Corona

Police Officers Association. And I just wanted to take a
minute and share a rank-and-file perspective with you
today.

I represent 162 sworn police officers who are CalPERS members and depend on you to make sound financial decisions to ensure the promises made to them will be kept.

The city of Corona is the third largest city in the County of Riverside, and during the past 10 years we've gone from nearly 900 employees -- full-time employees to 650, a reduction of 250 employees.

The police department's sworn staffing has seen a reduction of 31 police officers. And to demonstrate the impact that has had: A few years ago we had five detectives working on white color crimes - identity theft, embezzlement, fraud. Today we have one for a city of 165,000 people.

Citywide our staffing is at bare bones and any future cuts will have a huge impact on services.

I think we were all hopeful that revenues would increase when the stock market surge and the economy seemed to be coming around. However, any revenue increase realized by the city of Corona is being devoured by the increase in the PERS rates. While there are many factors

causing rate increases that are understandable - the longevity changing, the ramp up to reach the heightened funding levels - there's one factor that is unacceptable to us and, that is, the divestment policies of this Board.

During a recent public retirement journal seminar I witnessed the anger and fear expressed by the management of several cities and special districts. They all know that the rates -- if the rates continue to skyrocket, something has to give.

They all know that additional reductions in service are inevitable. It's likely more bankruptcies will occur. And ultimately the fund may be unable to keep the promises made to the working class in this State.

From a law enforcement perspective, I can tell you with great confidence that the policies in Sacramento towards the rule of law in California are making it a more dangerous place to live and work. We cannot afford to lose funding for law enforcement officers in exchange for a socially responsible investment strategy.

Your fiduciary responsibility is to the employees, the employers, and the taxpayers of this State, not to the many agendas of the many special interests that dominate Sacramento politics.

In closing, I want to tell you that although the Corona POA is one small group in the grand scheme of

things, we are committed to following through on this important issue. We're in contact with our state senator, our assembly member. We are meeting with PORAC leadership and other police associations in our area. And we are encouraging our city council members to bring this issue to the League of California Cities. We may be a small group, but we're going to do everything we can to have impact on this matter.

Thank you for your time.

PRESIDENT FECKNER: Thank you for your comments.

Mr. Snow.

Mr. SNOW: Mr. President and the Board of Administration. Thank you again for having this opportunity to speak to you.

I want to bring up just a few points from things
I heard on Monday at the Investment Committee meeting.

Also, something more personal. A friend -- a personal friend who retired in the last few years. He was diagnosed with pancreatic cancer recently. He served over 30 years in a law enforcement career. Has -- I think he has five -- five kids, who have grandchildren. He's only been able to enjoy his retirement for a few years.

And then I only bring that up not to try and evoke emotion but rather to just show you and demonstrate the sacrifices and the dangers that come with the

profession that we're engaged in.

And the retirement is one thing that we have to look forward to. I know that was one reason CalPERS was instituted in the first place. And one of the benefits of making that 3 percent at 50 was to entice quality workers for the State and for government employees. And sometimes we don't get that long retirement because of the environments that we work in. Not just policemen but also firemen.

One comment that was made on Monday was about the work that is done by this Board and by CalPERS itself.

And it had to do with the -- was the corporate engagement in the shareowner campaigns, which are pretty awesome. It was good to hear that. But I wanted to remind you of the work that is the sole work of this Board and of CalPERS; and, that is, right outside these doors back here on the little -- on the display, and it says to provide responsible and efficient stewardship of the system, deliver promised retirement and health benefits.

So this isn't to be done on the backs of cities or taxpayers, but it's done through investments.

And I think what you've done with Exxon and Occidental can also be done with some of the other things that we've divested from -- or CalPERS divested from and that is the -- either -- whether it's guns, whether it's

tobacco. Currently you have no influence in those industries in those areas. Whereas, if you were investing in them you would have some sort of say through those shareowner campaigns and through the corporate engagement, whereas now you have zero.

We've lost billions of dollars because of divestments. And that's billions of dollars that could have been used to -- you know, we wouldn't have -- maybe we still have these same issues but we don't know that. All that compounding money has just -- it sometimes blows our minds that we're losing that money because of the policies that are in place through divesting.

I'm not saying that we have to invest in everything and that divestment has to go away completely. But I think in some areas we can review it and maybe look into investing again in some of those industry.

Thank you for your time.

PRESIDENT FECKNER: Thank you for your comments.

Seeing no other requests, I do want to address a comment that was made last month under public comment and state that I held a meeting with Mr. Jelincic and his counsel and Mr. Slaton. I listened intently to all the information delivered by both sides. I then rendered my decision, and my decision, one that Mr. Jelincic had violated our confidentiality rules.

I then a month ago met with Mr. Jelincic about the issue, informed him that he was going to be receiving training, additional training in Bagley-Keene and open-meeting laws. And with that I considered the matter to be closed.

And the same comment that I've had for media in the past, will not disclose that information that was given because it was in a confidential matter and by doing so, I would be violating the same issue.

So as far as I'm concerned, this matter is closed.

With that, this meeting is adjourned. Everyone have a good month. We will see you next month.

And Board members, in consultation with Mr. Jacobs, there is no closed session following this because there's no information.

So we are done for the day.

(Thereupon the California Public Employees'
Retirement System, Board of Administration
open session meeting adjourned at 11:11 a.m.)

2.4

1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER 2 I, JAMES F. PETERS, a Certified Shorthand 3 Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify: That I am a disinterested person herein; that the 4 5 foregoing California Public Employees' Retirement System, 6 Board of Administration open session meeting was reported 7 in shorthand by me, James F. Peters, a Certified Shorthand 8 Reporter of the State of California. 9 That the said proceedings was taken before me, in 10 shorthand writing, and was thereafter transcribed, under 11 my direction, by computer-assisted transcription. I further certify that I am not of counsel or 12 13 attorney for any of the parties to said meeting nor in any 14 way interested in the outcome of said meeting. 15 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand 16 this 23rd day of May, 2017. 17 18 19 20 James & 21 22 23 JAMES F. PETERS, CSR 2.4 Certified Shorthand Reporter

25

License No. 10063